INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VII., No. 10. (NEW SERIES.)

OCTOBER, 1896.

Subscription, Post Free, SIX SHILLINGS PER ANN. IN INDIA, SIX RUPEES.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.
Indiana: Notes on Indian Affairs	289
The Indian Budget Farce, by Sir W. Wedderburn, Bart., M.P.	295
Hand-to-Mouth Adjustment, by Sir J. B. Phear ..	297
Land Revenue in Madras, by Professor A. F. Murison, LL.D.	299
Fresh Complications with the Afghans, by J. Dacosta ..	301
Our London Letter..	303
India in Parliament, 1896	305
Anglo-Indian Criminal Cases	307
William Morris	309
Indians and the Civil Service: Important Correspondence	312
Lord Welby's Commission: Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and Lord Wolseley..	313
A Budget Debate in Bombay: Speech by Lord Sandhurst	315
Prince Ranjitsinhji	316
"The Systematic Plunder of India"..	318
The Criminal Law of India	318
Review: Ancient India	319
Bibliography of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects..	320
Recent Official Publications	320

Indiana.

India and Armenia. THE eloquent speech in which Lord Elgin proposed the health of the Queen at the Viceregal Lodge on September 23rd was received, as all such speeches are, with genuine emotions of enthusiasm and loyalty in India. The fact that the Queen's reign is now the longest in British history offers, as Lord Elgin said, enticing opportunities for oratory. Nor have the opportunities been lost by statesmen or public writers. It is a mere coincidence that just at this moment the people of the United Kingdom are manifesting an eager desire to depose the Sultan of Turkey for his atrocious misdeeds, and are indignant at the thought that their hands are, or seem to be, tied. But what is it that ties them? The *St. James's Gazette* wrote the other day, in an article headed "Do we want a War?"—

> "Advances on the North-West Frontier of India, expeditions against Coffee, Kalcalli, or Prempeh, battles of Tel-el-Kebir, scuffling conflicts with Zulus in South Africa, and such-like slight efforts by which the strong, the disciplined, and the well-armed force back or beat down savagery, are serious on the spot and to the men to whom they show the face of death; but to a nation in vigorous health they are trifles. By war we mean one of those great struggles in which the equal, or nearly equal, are pitted against one another." . . . .

Now, advances on (or, to be accurate, beyond) the North-West Frontier of India may well seem to be trifles "to a nation in vigorous health" when the cost of them, in men and money, is borne by others. But they may not really be trifles, after all. The jealous suspicions of the Continent, and especially of Russia, are at present frustrating the humane intentions of the British nation. How far, we wonder, are those suspicions due to the "advances on the North-West Frontier of India" which the *St. James's* dismisses so lightly? How far are the suspicions of Russia likely to have been strengthened by such incidents as the violation of the Chitral proclamation, and Mr. Balfour's sweeping pronouncement that where the British soldier sets his foot, there he must remain? That is one reflection that occurs to those who try to regard the present excitement—to our thinking, an entirely praiseworthy excitement—against Abdul Hamid, from a truly Imperial point of view. Another reflection may be stated in words which Cobden wrote nearly forty years ago:—

> "What a pretentious and hypocritical people we are in our dealings with the outside world! How we abuse and bully King Bomba because he will not govern his lazzaroni according to our notions of constitutionalism! But when you propose to apply a little of our love of liberty to our own fellow-subjects in India, 'oh! oh!' is the reply you meet with in the House. Yet you would have no difficulty in carrying the cheers of the said House for any proposal to put the slaves in America or Cuba immediately on the same political level as their masters. This nation will meet with a terrible check some day unless it makes a little better progress in the science of self-knowledge."

We are not, of course, suggesting that so long as

there are blots upon British rule in India the British public should tolerate with complacency misrule, however foul, elsewhere. Our point is the very different one that we cannot be too hostile to any misrule; and it is to be hoped that the present storm of humanitarian emotion will not subside without producing at least some searchings of heart about India. Some people are so constituted as to perceive more readily something distant which somebody else should put right than something close at hand which they should put right themselves. But it is not exactly an admirable quality. Let us not forget that, as Principal Miller, Moderator of the Free Church of Scotland, said in an excellent address at Buckie the other day :—

> "In India we have to do with, perhaps, the acutest race on earth—at all events, the acutest in the way of judging personal character. We have not to do with savages, but with men who, in some ways, stand above any standard of intellectual activity that is to be found in Europe. That race has presented to it, not merely the theory of Christianity but the practice of it. They have before their eyes, not only an ideal Christianity, but actual Christians, or those who ought to be so. They know not only what Christians ought to be, but what they actually are."

Indians and the Civil Service.

We print on another page an important correspondence which during the past few months has taken place between Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and the Civil Service Commissioners. The correspondence, which Mr. Naoroji has performed a public service in initiating, brings out the fact that, except in the case of commissions in the army and cadetships in the navy, as to which we may have something to say later, British subjects in India are equally admissible with British subjects in the United Kingdom to the examinations held by the Civil Service Commission. It is satisfactory to find that in the matter, at any rate, of employment in the Civil Service of the United Kingdom, the legitimate claims of our Indian fellow-subjects are theoretically recognised. We say "theoretically," because the actual mode in which the examinations of the Civil Service Commission are held reduces the theory of equality throughout the Empire almost to a dead letter. In other words, while, for the convenience of Scotch and Irish candidates, examinations are held in Edinburgh and Dublin, Indian candidates are required to travel many thousands of miles, and are impeded by special difficulties, not solely of a pecuniary kind, if they seek to avail themselves of their rights as Imperial citizens. It may, no doubt, be urged that as the examinations in question have to do with employment in the United Kingdom, Edinburgh and Dublin have stronger claims than Calcutta and Bombay to be regarded as examination centres. But if we admit the force of this argument, what is to be said of the obstinacy, and, we must add, the subterfuges by which, in spite of Acts of Parliament, resolutions of the House of Commons, and the most solemn pledges of British honour, British Indian subjects are still compelled to come over to London in order to be examined for employment in India itself? Indians may well ask whether Englishmen can think of this piece of un-English tyranny without humiliation. The truth is, of course, that in this matter highly placed officials, including a Secretary of State, have set at defiance the pledges and the expressed wishes of the British public. It is not by such methods that the loyalty and goodwill of India are likely to be maintained, and it behoves the people of the United Kingdom, through their representatives in Parliament, to wipe out the stigma before it is too late.

Wanted: Simultaneous Examinations.

These considerations once more derive weight from the results of the annual Competitive Examination for the Civil Service of India. Sixty-two places were open to competition, but the recent list apparently contains the names of only three Indians—Mr. Atul Chandra Chatterjee, Mr. Ardeshir Kaikhoshru Cama and Mr. Satyendra Chandra Mallik, and one Eurasian, Mr. Paul Eugene Cammiade. The full list of successful candidates, whose selection is, however, conditional on their passing the usual medical examination, is as follows :—

Name	Total marks.
Chatterjee, Atul Chandra	2,851
Campbell, John	2,739
Johnston, James	2,719
Davis, Charles Thomas	2,654
Butler, Frederick George Augustus	2,645
Sanger, William	2,638
O'Donnell, Samuel Perry	2,611
Barstow, George Lewis	2,547
Emanuel, Alfred Edward Lewis	2,539
Malan, Walter de Mérindol	2,501
Woodman, Henry Charles	2,494
Goligher, Hugh Garvan	2,477
Cama, Ardeshir Kaikhoshru	2,435
Holland, Leonard Duncan	2,343
Swann, Nathanael Emilius Egerton	2,331
Maxwell, John	2,284
Moore, Pierce Langriche	2,281
Stutchbury, Harold Owen	2,262
Legh, Edmund Willoughby	2,241
Johnson, Christopher Thomas Heaton	2,236
Crump, Frederic Cuthbert	2,191
Clayton, Harold	2,173
Hardiman, John Thomas Percy	2,164
Cassels, Walter Seytoun	2,138
Henriques, Quentin Quixano	2,137
Batchelor, Ernest	2,117
Baker, William Thomas Webb	2,106
Pennell, Charles Stuart	2,074
Paddison, George Frederick	2,071
French, Lewis	2,063
Cole, Alfred William Richardson	2,052

Name.	Total Marks.
Cammiade, Paul Eugene	2,012
Lambert, George Bancroft	1,957
Samuel, Louis Eveleigh Bawtree	1,950
Smith, Francis Jagoe	1,939
Thompson, John Perronet	1,918
Ellis, Thomas Peter	1,901
Gwynn, Arthur Perceval	1,891
Tanner, Edmund Stuteley	1,887
Hignell, Sidney Robert	1,872
Strong, Frederick William	1,867
Wilkinson, Walter Hugh John	1,865
Kealy, Edward Herbert	1,856
Parker, Aubrey Hastings	1,833
Ratcliff, Sidney Charles	1,821
Crofton, Charles Stanhope Foster	1,813
Glancy, Reginald Isidore Robert	1,812
Loftus-Tottenham, Alexander Robert	1,804
Hutchinson, Henry Norton	1,780
Mallik, Satyendra Chandra	1,769
Cook, Arthur Willstead	1,757
Salkeld, Henry Lyde	1,744
Smith, Boteler Chernocke	1,737
Moscardi, Alexander Francis George	1,703
Gourlay, William Robert	1,700
Pipon, Philip James Griffiths	1,699
Bosworth Smith, Bertrand Nigel	1,673
Harcourt, Henry	1,667
Nunn, Harold	1,664
Cross, George Harold	1,661
Dewar, Francis	1,659
Adami, Leonard Christian	1,641

India may well be proud of the performance of Mr. Chatterjee, who not only heads the list, but has a substantial surplus to spare. Mr. Cama's name also appears among the successful candidates for the

Home Civil Service and the Eastern Cadetships, the three examinations being now held together. But these brilliant successes really serve to show at once the injustice and the unwisdom of the conditions which are imposed upon Indian candidates for posts in the service of their own country. India produces a Chatterjee, who carries off in the schools laurels that remind us of Prince Ranjitsinhji's achievements in the cricket-field. One Indian heads the list of competition-wallahs while another heads the list of batting averages. But the point is, how many mute, inglorious Chatterjees are debarred from competing by the preliminary fine involved in the present pilgrimage to London? Nor is it merely that this thought rankles in the minds of Indians. The present system also lowers the mental calibre of the public service. It will be seen that the totals of marks in the present list range from 2,851 to 1,641. Does anybody imagine that the tail-end of the list would have shown an equal falling-off if the examination had also been held simultaneously in India? On the contrary, it is precisely the contention that very many more Indians would then obtain places, and thereby raise the average, that candid Englishmen advance in support of the present inequitable system.

A Budget Debate in Bombay.

A Bombay correspondent writes:—"The annual meeting of the Bombay Legislative Council at Poona for the discussion of the Budget has come and gone. It has left far more favourable impressions than ever before. In fact, not since the Act of 1892 came into force has there been such a successful meeting. The reason is to be found in the attitude of the head of the Government. It fell to the lot of that sporting politician, Lord Harris, to inaugurate the expansion of the Bombay Legislative Council, and he seemed to do everything in his power to minimise the good effects of the new privileges. Hardly a Budget meeting passed in his time without his quarrelling with some non-official member or other. Last year the responsibility of framing the Budget proposals fell upon the late Governor. The financial member in charge of the Budget, the Hon. Mr. Nugent, taking his cue from his late master, became discourteous towards the non-official members, calling them exhibitors of hobby horses in a Council which he likened to a circus. As Mr. Nugent had the last word in the debate, the non-official members whom he attacked had to exercise forbearance for a twelvemonth. When their turn came this year, they had his authority to regard the Council as a circus and each member as the exhibitor of a hobby horse. Mr. Nugent, who seemed to be thoroughly ashamed of his last year's performance, was eager to obtain the earliest opportunity of clearing himself from the imputation of a bureaucrat:

> 'I trust,' he said, 'that now I shall not again be inveighed against as insolent and presumptuous, and abused as a bureaucrat, because I liken some hon. members to steam-hammers or their workers. I am not quite sure what is the precise meaning of that common term in Indian invective, a bureaucrat, but being interpreted it signifies a creature who lives on red tape, and, stimulated by that exciting diet, attempts to ride rough-shod over everyone who is not a civilian or an official. I humbly do not think that I am a bureaucrat, and I would most certainly emphatically disclaim the charge of being insolent and impertinent, most especially so to the native gentlemen on this Council, most of whom I have known for years and I am proud to regard as personal friends.' (Hear, hear.)

Mr. Nugent had no occasion this year to suggest that the speeches of some of the non-official members might be taken as read. Each of them spoke out what he had to say, as all had come well prepared. The meeting was to have been held on August 4th, but it was deferred until the 17th in compliance with the wish of a large majority of the non-officials who found the time originally allotted for the study of the Budget figures too short. The additional time was usefully employed in careful study of the Budget. Even Mr. Nugent was constrained to express his

> 'sense of the care, acumen, and intelligence, if I may presume to say so, with which they (the non-official members) have evidently studied subjects often technical and not very easy of comprehension, and examined the tangled labyrinth of figures termed a Budget. . . . . Weak joints in our armour are detected, useful suggestions are made, and attention is called to possible improvements of our system. Outside criticism of this character is always wholesome. It is well that we should see our estimates, our expenditure, our income, and our administration as influential and highly educated native gentlemen, who do not view them through Secretariat spectacles, behold them, and should receive hints as to objects on which we might, in the opinion of our critics, expend more or expend less than we do, and as to the best way in which we should obtain the rupees requisite to carry on in full working order the machinery of the State.'

Admirable but —Fruitless.

"Mr. Birdwood spoke in the same strain. But the best speech came from Lord Sandhurst, the President of the Council. 'I have now had,' said His Excellency, 'something like twenty years' experience of the House of Lords, and I venture to say it would be impossible to find any Legislative Chamber in which the Budget proceedings could have been conducted with more decorum than those of the Council over which I preside, or where more carefully prepared speeches could be heard, speeches better both in style and tone than those we have heard to-day and yesterday. Some of the speeches were long, but of that I do not at all complain. This is the one opportunity in the year when hon. members can put forward their views in this Chamber in regard to the financial and general administration of Govern-

ment. Not only have the speeches been good. They have also been impartial, to the purpose, and free from personalities. I will say this, that instead of the Budget discussion being looked upon by members of Government as a tedious burden, taking up a vast amount of the time of those engaged in administering the affairs of the Presidency, I shall look upon these two days' proceedings with considerable pleasure, though unfortunately we have chosen for this discussion the first fine day we have had in Poona for the last five weeks, and have had to spend the whole of the day in this Chamber. But business must come first and pleasure afterwards.' It is unnecessary to discuss here the manifold topics which were passed in review. The certificates which non-official members have obtained from official members and from the head of the Government are enough to show the intelligence, acumen, and moderation which were the marked features of their criticisms. But the practical question is this: if non-official criticism, though sound, is to have no effect on the Budget, what is the practical outcome of the discussion? For the last three years members have been offering valuable suggestions on a variety of matters connected with the finances of the Presidency and the estimates of income and expenditure. But not one of them has been acted upon. Everything in the Budget is sanctioned and arranged beforehand, and members are invited simply to express their approval and disapproval. That is all. And the whole thing rests there, after the expressions of such approval or disapproval. What is wanted is the power to divide. This is the only means by which the practical suggestions of members of the Council can be turned to account. As matters stand at present, the Budget discussions in the various provincial Councils are a mere farce. The Budget estimates from the provincial Governments are prepared and sent up to the Imperial Government in secret, or without being openly discussed. The Imperial Government arranges them also in secret. The Imperial Budget is discussed as a mere matter of form. There is no power to divide on points arising out of the Budget discussion. The whole thing is unnatural and unsubstantial. The order of procedure should be totally reversed. First, the provincial estimates should be discussed and passed by the provincial Government. They should then be presented to the Imperial Government, who should frame their estimates on the bases of the provincial estimates. These Imperial estimates should come on for discussion in the Imperial Council. Until this is done, there will be no reality in Budget discussions provincial or Imperial, and the privileges granted by the Act of 1892 must remain to a large extent illusory and disappointing."

The Right of Interpellation.

THE opportunities for obtaining information from the Government are so limited in India that they cannot be too jealously guarded against further restriction. One of the most effective instruments at present existing is the right of interpellation in the Legislative Councils—a proceeding which corresponds to some slight extent to the Parliamentary practice of putting questions to Ministers. There was recently an attempt in Bengal to limit this right so far as it affected questions on the Budget. But the Lieutenant-Governor afterwards withdrew from an untenable position. A still more important controversy has now arisen in Bombay, where Mr. Pherozeshah M. Mehta, an "additional" member of the Legislative Council, and one of the ablest and most respected men in the Presidency, has appealed to the Viceroy against the refusal of Lord Sandhurst to admit the following question:—

"Whether Government are aware that the system under which appeals from the decisions of Agency Courts in Kathiawar and elsewhere are disposed of by the Bombay Government is causing deep and general dissatisfaction among all parties concerned in them; and whether they would be pleased to consider the extreme advisability of devising, without undue delay, some measures by which the appeals could be judicially heard and determined."

Lord Sandhurst appears to have disallowed this question as involving "matters coming under the political control of Government," and to have referred Mr. Mehta to No. vi of the rules under Section 2 of the Indian Councils' Act, 1892. But Mr. Mehta, who is a distinguished lawyer, argues that the decision is illegal. The point of the rule referred to is, he contends, to exclude, not "political" questions, but questions about matters which are not under the control of the local Government. Subject to this exception, and to certain regulations as to form, any question may be asked. Lord Sandhurst's objection, which he declined to re-consider, appears to lay emphasis upon the distinction between "political control" and "administration." The distinction would seem to be entirely new, as Mr. Mehta is able to cite instances not merely of political questions which have been allowed and answered, but actually of questions dealing with the topic he proposed to raise. Much will depend upon the decision of the Viceroy in Council as to the legality of Lord Sandhurst's ruling, though the *Pioneer* and the *Madras Mail* go too far in assuming that if the ruling be upheld all questions relating to the Native States will be barred. It is obvious, however, that Lord Elgin's decision will have an importance far beyond the scope of the particular question out of which it will have arisen. That Lord Elgin should be invited to permit a question refused by Lord Sandhurst is indeed one of "life's little ironies."

"State Landlordism in Madras."

IT is sometimes useful, however distasteful it may be, for journalists to read their own journals, to the end that they may avoid contradicting themselves. A recent issue of that unconsciously humorous publication, the *Madras Weekly Mail*, contained an editorial article entitled "The Idle Middleman," denouncing Mr. Rogers, who, as our readers are aware, has brought to public notice the deplorable state of the Land Revenue Administration of the Madras Presidency. This was the sort of thing:—

"The petty provincial pride and jealousy which make so many Anglo-Indians ridiculous are nowhere more rampant than in the Bombay Presidency. In any other part of India it would be hardly possible to find an official of standing and repute like Mr. Alexander Rogers rash enough to publicly denounce, and, in plain English, to traduce the administration of another Presidency of which he is profoundly ignorant. Many of our readers have no doubt heard quite enough about Mr. Rogers, but some of our native friends are still trying to persuade themselves that Mr. Rogers is right, and the Madras Government culpably wrong."

And so forth and so on. Yet we find summarised, in an article headed "The Re-settlement of the Godavery District," in the same issue of the *Madras Weekly Mail*, the official opinion of Mr. Clerk, Deputy Commissioner of Settlement, who was directed by the Board of Revenue to make enquiries on the spot regarding the incidence of the present rates of assessment in the Godavery and Kistna Districts, and consider how far and in what manner they needed to be revised. The substance of Mr. Clerk's opinion is given as follows: "The original classification was not uniform, inequalities in classification being discounted as far as possible by the group assigned to the village." This means, in plain English, that the mistakes in classification were not rectified, but deliberately allowed to stand and to be kept out of sight by wrongly transferring villages from one group to another. "The grouping of villages for dry assessment had not been made with reference to markets, canals, etc., but solely with reference to the fertility of their soils." This method of grouping is, of course, entirely wrong. The classification of soils according to their fertility, if rightly carried out, adjusts equitably the burden of assessment to be laid on the several lands as compared *inter se*, and in no way discriminates between the general level of revenue charges to be laid on the several villages equitably according to the greater or less cost to their cultivators of conveying their produce to market. Again, "the capacity of the several sources of irrigation in each village had not been taken into consideration." A more flagrant blot in classification of wet soils could hardly be conceived. Moreover, under the existing system there were only three sorts in each class of soil, and the scale of money rates was consequently limited. In regard to the last Mr. Clerk was of opinion that a more elastic table of rates was necessary to lighten the admittedly heavy assessment on the poorer soils. He also pointed out that ever since the original settlement the black clay wet soils had been paying higher assessment than the black loam, notwithstanding the fact that the crop experiments proved that the latter are more productive than the former. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that Mr. Clerk strongly recommended, after discovering this state of affairs, that there should be a re-classification of all soils, wet and dry, within the delta on the lines sanctioned in the Tanjore district. Could there be a stronger confirmation of the contentions that Mr. Rogers has urged in our columns with regard to the system of classification of soils and cash assessment on lands in Madras than this official report submitted by an experienced Settlement Officer under the Board of Revenue, after personal enquiry into the existing state of affairs?

Twelve Months in Gondal.

"HAPPY the people that have no history." The Dewan of the Gondal State, in his interesting "summary of events of the administration" for the year 1895-96, observes that the past twelve months were not marked by stirring or important incidents. "The whole period passed off smoothly, bearing marks of satisfactory progress all round." The conclusion is a welcome one, and it is borne out by the compact record which follows it. The population of the State is estimated at 161,036. The average revenue is Rx. 120,000. There are 76 schools in the State, they number 5,417 pupils, and the figures for last year compared with the figures of the year before show a notable increase alike in the number of scholars and in the average attendance. The heir-apparent is now at Eton, and another son of the Thakor Saheb is reading medicine at Edinburgh. During the year his highness has instituted a new scholarship—in veterinary surgery. "Any system of medical relief must be incomplete without adequate provision being made for treating and healing the diseases of useful domestic animals. These dumb creatures have a claim upon human sympathy." The previous report mentioned the efforts put forth by the Thakor Saheb to extend industrial enterprise. We now learn that the Dhoraji ginning factory, which has been enlarged, is working profitably, and that similar factories have been started by private individuals at Gondal and Bhayawadar. "A cotton-growing district like Gondal is a fair field for the development of ginning factories, and the desire of the Darbar to encourage this new form of industry can find no better proof than in the reduction this year of Mandvi Dan, or octroi duty, from three pies to two pies per rupee's worth of cotton imported for ginning

at the factories in the State." The land revenue administration was recently remodelled on a basis of cash assessment which appears to be highly popular. The number of offences committed showed a decrease of sixty as compared with the preceding year. "The fire engines," in this progressive community, "are reported to be in good order, and worked well in putting out the conflagrations. The police are regularly drilled in the use of the engines." One reads with unaffected pleasure this simple record of tranquility and contentment.

Touting for Pasteurism.

THE movement in favour of establishing a Pasteur Institute in Northern India has been mainly, if not wholly, promoted by the Medical Service and others of the official classes. It is now, we find, being "pushed," by methods which exhibit something very like compulsion, through the departments. In a letter that is before us, written by an officer's wife in India, it is stated that "Government" has sent round "an appeal," which in due official course has reached H.M. regimental headquarters, urging that subscriptions should be sent to support the scheme for a Pasteur Institute. It is well known that the whole of the native Indian press has strongly opposed that cruel system. But its fanatical supporters take no notice of the arguments advanced from that quarter. There are, however, many officers and other Europeans in the services who are not less strongly opposed to Pasteurism, on scientific as well as humanitarian grounds, than Indians are, and they object to being put under "moral" compulsion to subscribe towards that which they detest. They regard these demi-official appeals as an unwarrantable exercise of departmental influence. Besides, there is now no excuse for forcing on the delusive and pernicious Pasteur remedy for rabies. The true and effective cure for hydrophobia by means of the vapour bath and the Buisson process is available in all the large towns and cantonments of India, the requisite appliances for that purpose having been supplied by the devoted efforts of an English lady, assisted by Indian medical men.

Morley's Life of Cobden.

THE fiftieth anniversary of the Repeal of the Corn Laws has afforded an occasion not only for congratulatory banquets and speeches but also for the re-issue, in a new and cheaper form, of Mr. John Morley's Life of Richard Cobden (London: T. Fisher Unwin). Among political biographies this admirable work has from the first taken a leading place, Mr. Morley's transcendent qualities as a political writer greatly enhancing the interest which necessarily attaches to Cobden's career itself. This is not the place, nor is it the time, to attempt an appreciation of the work as a whole. But we may express the hope that in this cheaper form it will come into the hands of very many who have hitherto known it only by name. Mr. Morley elsewhere praises the best work of Burke for "the vigorous grasp of masses of compressed detail, the wide illumination from great principles of human experience, the strong and masculine feeling for the two great political ends of Justice and Freedom, the large and generous interpretation of expediency, the morality, the vision, the noble temper." Nobody, not even Mr. Arthur Balfour (whose well-known article on Cobden and the Manchester School is no mean indication of the differences between the two men), would hesitate to ascribe like qualities and achievements to Mr. Morley himself. As for Cobden's opinions on British rule in India, it is common to say that he was unduly pessimistic and that his gloomy anticipations have been refuted by experience. But how far is this judgment really sound? Cobden's reiterated opinions as to the essential hopelessness of British rule in India may, indeed, betray some signs of exaggeration. But will any candid reader (see especially vol. ii., pp. 205—217, and p. 360) deny that in 1857 and the following years he put his finger on many deep, underlying faults. For example:—

"The religious people who now tell us that we must hold India to convert it, ought, I should think, to be convinced by what has passed that sending red coats as well as black to Christianise a people is not the most likely way to insure the blessing of God on our missionary efforts."

"Hindustan must be ruled by those who live on that side of the globe. Its people will prefer to be ruled badly—*according to our notions*—by its own colour, kith, and kin, than to submit to the humiliation of being better governed by a succession of transient intruders from the antipodes."

"There must be a fierce spirit of resentment, not unmixed with contempt for the ruling class, pervading the native mind. From the moment that I had satisfied myself that a feeling of alienation was constantly *increasing* with both the natives and the English (we had some striking evidence to this effect before our Committee in 1853), I made up my mind that it must end in trouble sooner or later. It is impossible that a people can permanently be used for their own obvious and conscious degradation."

"The English people in Parliament have undertaken to be responsible for governing one hundred and fifty millions of people, despotically, in India. They have adopted the principle of a military despotism, and I have no faith in such an undertaking being anything but a calamity and a curse to the people of England. . . . . Is it not just possible that we may become corrupted at home by the reaction of arbitrary political maxims in the East upon our domestic politics, just as Greece and Rome were demoralised by their contact with Asia?"

Our only quarrel in respect of this re-issue is with the publisher. We cannot bring ourselves to believe that Mr. Morley approved the hideous allegorical binding—bright yellow corn waving in a bright green field—with which Mr. Fisher Unwin challenges the wares of the railway bookstall.

THE INDIAN BUDGET FARCE.

By Sir William Wedderburn, Bart., M.P.

I had always supposed that no sane human being regarded the annual debate on the Indian Budget as anything but a discreditable farce. But from their utterances on the 13th of August last it appears that Lord George Hamilton and his faithful henchman Sir Henry Fowler think otherwise. The financial affairs of some 200 millions of our fellow citizens are disposed of at one sitting, before a scanty, jaded, and impatient House, at the close of an expiring Session; and during this one sitting the House is supposed to deal sufficiently with the annual expenditure of nearly 1,000 millions of rupees, a rupee being to the famine-stricken Indian rayat more important than a pound sterling is to the British taxpayer. This seems bad enough. But things are worse even than at first sight appears. For when at a previous period of the Session any question arises in India which dangerously excites public opinion, such as the Chitral breach of faith, the inequitable revision of the cotton duties, or the unjust deposition of an Indian prince, there exists no recognised opportunity for discussing the grievance while still fresh; and if an independent member seeks to make an opportunity on the Queen's speech, or on a motion of adjournment, he is angrily told by both front benches that the time for discussing all such grievances is the Indian Budget night. The action of the Secretary of State may or may not be justified in the particular cases brought forward. But no one outside of Bedlam can suppose that such accumulated grievances can be properly debated in one evening at the end of the Session, in addition to a calm and sufficient discussion of Indian finance. Yet Lord George Hamilton and Sir H. Fowler seem to be quite satisfied with existing arrangements; at least both are vehemently opposed to the moderate and simple scheme suggested by me for improving the debate; and neither of them has any suggestion whatever to make on his own account.

At first sight it may seem strange that the Secretary of State, who is at the head of the Indian Executive, and who is responsible to Parliament for the good name of our Indian administration, should be so careless of our national credit and reputation in this matter. But if we examine Lord George Hamilton's statements, and consider the position of the parties concerned, we shall see that the opposition to the proposed amendment arises from simple causes and influences very potent with the official mind, such as love of unchecked authority, dislike of criticism, and distrust of the wisdom and capacity of all popular assemblies. What was my proposal? and what was its object? The wording of the amendment was as follows:

> "With a view to the effectual discharge of its existing duty in respect of the finances of India, this House is of opinion that the East India Accounts should each year be examined and reported on by a Select Committee of the House, thus *mutatis mutandis* assimilating the practice as regards Indian Accounts to that followed, by means of the Public Accounts Committee, in respect of the accounts of the United Kingdom."

It will be seen that this amendment seeks to impose no new duty upon Parliament; its asks for no new powers; it casts no reflection upon the financial administration of India. The proposal has reference solely to the existing and acknowledged duty of Parliament; and points out a way in which that duty may be more effectively performed. Moreover the method suggested is that which we employ in managing our own financial affairs. As regards our own public expenditure we do not give the Executive a free hand; we do not take it for granted that the various spending departments will always practise strict economy; nor do we accept all their self-praise for gospel. Why should we do all these foolish things as regards Indian expenditure? Every item of Imperial expenditure is jealously scrutinised in the interest of the British taxpayer. Jealous scrutiny is more, not less, needed in the case of Indian expenditure; for as regards India we allow the people no voice in their own affairs. The Indian taxpayer has no representatives. We have taken all power into our own hands, thereby constituting ourselves trustees; and I maintain that we are guilty of a shameful neglect of duty if we do not extend to Indian finance the same rigorous care we consider necessary for our own.

Now what is the official reply to this claim that the Imperial Parliament should effectively exercise its control as the supreme and ultimate authority? Lord George Hamilton replies as follows:—

> "It is often said in certain quarters that an improved system of control by Parliament over Indian finance could be introduced. I hold the contrary view, believing that the financial control exercised over expenditure in India is more efficacious than any control that could be exercised in this country would be."

What an extraordinary confusion of ideas this answer betrays! If we suppose the shareholders in a gold mine desirous of appointing a Committee to satisfy themselves regarding the financial position of their property, would it be any answer to this demand if the Chairman of the Directors told them that he disapproved of the proposal, because in his opinion the Managing Director maintained over his subordinates in South Africa a more efficacious control than the shareholders could maintain over the Directors at home? The question is not one of departmental discipline, of the authority of the

Viceroy in Council over his subordinates; it is a question of constitutional control by Parliament over the whole Indian executive, and especially over the Secretary of State himself who is the responsible head of that whole executive. The objection therefore narrows itself into the natural dislike of a Secretary of State to Parliamentary control over himself being made anything but illusory.

But Lord George Hamilton has a further reason for objecting to my proposal. To quote his own words:—

"It was no use whatever to appoint a Select Committee to enquire generally into Indian finance. The finances of India constituted a very large question, and he was convinced it would be almost impossible to bring the members of a committee of this kind together in sufficient numbers and sufficiently often to enable them to report with effect on a question of such importance."

This expression of opinion is not flattering to the intelligence, business capacity, or public spirit of the House of Commons. But does not the noble lord perceive that he is proving too much? If the subject is so large and difficult that a Select Committee, including all the Indian experts in the House, appointed at the beginning of the Session, and working until its close, cannot prepare a report that will make the financial position of India intelligible to the House, does it not follow that there must be something defective in the form of the accounts presented to Parliament? If even aided by the labours of a Select Committee, which year by year would become more competent, the House cannot be made to understand the true financial position of India, what an empty mockery the present debate must be, when the House, without any such assistance, is expected to decide whether or not the Secretary of State has given a satisfactory account of his stewardship. I quite agree that the subject is large, difficult, and important. All the more reason therefore is there to utilize all the resources at the disposal of the House; and of all these resources none is more effectual than a well-chosen Select Committee. To say beforehand that the members of such a Committee will neglect their duty by absenting themselves, as suggested by Lord George Hamilton, is to cast an unmerited slur upon the House. A Select Committee has just been appointed to investigate the affairs of the Chartered Company. Does anyone say that they will neglect their duty? No; every one knows that the whole matter will be thoroughly sifted and the truth made known. The financial condition of India, her solvency or insolvency, is a subject which is not more intricate nor less important, than any question which can arise with regard to South Africa. Let then the experiment be tried. An imperfect report, suggesting where a better remedy may be sought, will be better than no report at all. And if the report is imperfect, either owing to want of due diligence on the part of the members, or owing to the defective information supplied by the Indian executive, we shall at any rate know where the blame should rest for the discredit now attaching to the management of Indian financial business in the House of Commons.

For my own part I firmly believe that a Select Committee of the kind proposed would be quite up to the work; and I have solid reasons for this belief, because during the present and the last Parliament the work now in question has been actually done, under great disadvantages, by a certain number of members interested in India. These members have voluntarily associated themselves together under the name of the Indian Parliamentary Committee, having for their object to promote a just and sympathetic treatment of Indian affairs. This Committee now numbers 120 members, including a smaller working Committee of ten, which has from time to time submitted to the Secretary of State, and circulated to every member of the House, carefully prepared Notes upon the financial statements supplied to Parliament by the Indian Executive. These representations dealt with substantial questions of account directly affecting the conclusions to be drawn from the financial statements put forward by the Secretary of State; such, for example, as the true bearing of loss by exchange on the financial position, and the obligations arising from the establishment of the Famine Insurance Fund. It is true that the contentions thus raised by the Indian Parliamentary Committee did not receive from Sir H. Fowler, when Secretary of State for India, the courtesy of a detailed answer in his Indian Budget speech. But that the objections raised were of a kind deserving serious attention will be seen from the Interim Report of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, which is now being published, and especially from the evidence of Sir Henry Waterfield, the principal financial expert of the India Office.

There is not space within the limits of an article to notice in detail the various issues thus raised, but they were all of a strictly practical kind. Briefly stated the contention regarding loss by exchange was this. The whole position taken up by Sir J. Westland, the Finance Minister at Calcutta, depended for its justification upon his assertion that the embarrassments of the Indian Government arose from the loss by Exchange, and from that alone. This allegation, which was accepted and endorsed by the Secretary of State, was directly traversed by the Indian Parliamentary Committee, who showed, by an exhaustive analysis of the official figures, that the financial difficulties of the Indian Government did not arise solely, or even mainly, from exchange, but that they were caused by the excessive increase in-

unproductive Military and Civil Expenditure. This important contention, which struck at the very root of official optimism, was left unanswered by Sir H. Fowler, then Secretary of State. He could do this with impunity because the Indian Parliamentary Committee is not a body appointed by the House. But if these same facts and arguments had been brought before the House by a Select Committee, he could not have ignored them. He would have been compelled to face real practical issues and to meet the definite contentions of Indian public opinion, instead of riding away on the wings of self-laudation and unproved assertion. In the case of the Famine Insurance Fund the labours of the Indian Parliamentary Committee have met with a more gratifying result. In a paper entitled "The Poor Man's Lamb," the Indian Parliamentary Committee pointed out how, in order to meet recurring famines, the Indian Government, some fifteen years ago, created a Famine Insurance Fund as a "sacred trust," and imposed new and special taxes which were to be used for this purpose, "and for no other purpose whatever." Accordingly the Committee protested strongly against this Fund being misappropriated in order to pay for exchange compensation to the European services, and for military aggression beyond the frontier. In answer Sir H. Fowler not only defended the misappropriation, but denied the existence of the Fund. Now, however, the protest has borne good fruit; and in the present year the greater portion of the money has been restored to its proper purpose, while Lord George Hamilton in his Budget speech not only refers repeatedly to the "Famine Insurance Fund" as an existing entity, but, somewhat regardless of his predecessor's claims to be a financial expert, points out that "those conversant with Indian finance know that it was established by Sir John Strachey in 1881." It appears, therefore, that there is plenty of good and useful work to be done by a Select Committee if once appointed.

The above facts I think prove (1) that the Indian Budget debate as at present conducted is discreditable to the House of Commons; (2) that the appointment of a Select Committee to examine and report on the Indian accounts is a moderate and reasonable proposal in accordance with Parliamentary precedent; (3) that the objections raised to this proposal have no force; and (4) that the voluntary labours of the Indian Parliamentary Committee show that the appointment of a Select Committee would improve the Indian Budget debate by making it turn upon definite practical issues, would assist members of Parliament in obtaining a better understanding of Indian accounts, and would enable the House to lay down and enforce the principles upon which Indian finance should be administered.

HAND-TO-MOUTH ADJUSTMENT.

By Sir J. B. Phear,
Late Chief Justice of Ceylon.

We learn from the recent Budget speech of the Secretary of State for India that that troublesome imp "loss by exchange" continues to be as unknowable and erratic as ever, so much so that Lord G. Hamilton felt himself obliged to advise the House of Commons to accept with some discount the favourable character of the figures, which he said he was about to lay before it.

The three financial years with which he had to deal were those of 1894-95, 1895-96, 1896-97.

Of the first of these years the accounts were completed and closed, and although the Indian Government originally budgeted for a deficiency (I wonder what the District Auditor or the Local Government Board would say to a County Council which did such a thing!) the completed accounts show a surplus of Rx. 693,110.

So far, no doubt, so good. But this satisfactory result, such as it is, can hardly be attributed to anything but pure luck, for it appears that as a matter of fact the Government of India had in its Budget under-estimated what may be termed its Home expenditure by Rx. 2,121,468 and over-estimated its Indian expenditure by Rx. 293,382, *i.e.*, as the effect of its double mistake had under-estimated its total expenditure by Rx. 1,828,086.

Fortunately, however, the Government's foresight proved not more accurate on the receipt than on the expenditure side of the accounts, for it under-estimated the receipts by Rx. 2,823,096, and so it came about that after all the accounts closed with the small favourable balance of Rx. 693,110.

The large increase in the actual receipts as compared with the budget estimate was due mainly to an unexpected improvement in opium, amounting to Rx. 1,248,110, and an increase in customs of Rx. 941,000 arising from after-imposed taxation, *i.e.*, taxation imposed to meet the deficit.

At first glance this state of finance does not seem to be a thing to be proud of. But the Secretary of State contrives very ingeniously to find in it ground for exalting the Indian Government to the highest pitch of excellence in financial administration. First, he says the surplus is better than the figures represent it, for the increase in expenditure includes the item of Rx. 555,000 by which the Budget amount of contribution to the Famine Insurance Fund, namely, Rx. 445,000, was afterwards augmented in order to raise the contribution to Rx. 1,000,000, and this is really a saving and not expenditure, so that we are entitled to reckon that we have a virtual surplus of Rx. 1,248,110 instead of only Rx. 693,110. One can only wonder why the Secretary of State, while he

was about it, did not remove the whole of the Famine Fund contribution, namely, Rx. 1,000,000, and not merely part of it from the expenditure side of the accounts, so as to raise the surplus to the still higher figure of Rx. 1,693,110.

Next, dealing further with the expenditure side of the accounts the Secretary of State remarks that the one item alone of loss by exchange, viz., Rx. 2,121,468 (which he evidently looks upon as so much coin, that has in some unaccountable way leaked out of the till, unconnected with the expenditure proper of the country), actually exceeds the item Rx. 1,828,000, which appears by the accounts to be the excess of expenditure beyond the estimate; and, therefore, he triumphantly exclaims there was obviously no real increase of the expenditure at all.

So much, indeed, was it to the contrary that, adding together this item of loss, Rx. 2,121,468, and the item Rx. 555,000 (augmentation of contribution to Famine Fund), and on the ground that neither of them is true expenditure, subtracting their sum, Rx. 2,676,468, from the total net expenditure given by the accounts, namely, Rx. 59,959,786, we get as the *real* expenditure Rx. 57,283,318, which is less by Rx. 848,382 than Rx. 58,131,700, the originally estimated expenditure. Consequently by this method we discover that the Government of India has accomplished the remarkable feat of keeping within their original estimate by Rx. 848,000. And the Secretary of State adds:

"I do not remember any occasion here (*i.e.*, at Westminster) when the Treasury have been able to save £800,000 in their original estimates;"

herein betraying once more his inveterate inability to distinguish between Rs. 10 in India and £1 sterling in England, for on his own data Rx. 848,382 could not stand for more than about £460,000 in support of his argument.

It is surely difficult to believe that the House of Commons willingly accepted manipulation of figures in this fashion as serious contribution to a discussion of the state of Indian finances.

Proceeding to the next year 1895-96, of which, although it expired some months ago, the accounts are as yet only approximately ascertained, the Secretary of State characterised it as a very remarkable financial year. The Indian Government budgeted originally for a surplus of Rx. 46,200; but as things have turned out it appears to have underestimated the net receipts by Rx. 1,405,300 and the net expenditure by Rx. 500,100, figures that have the effect of adding Rx. 905,200 to the surplus, making it Rx. 951,400 instead of Rx. 46,200.

The increase in the receipts beyond the original estimate is attributed to an improvement of Rx. 874,000 in opium, and an advance under the other heads of the revenue generally to the amount of Rx. 531,300 in the whole, making in the aggregate a total of Rx. 1,405,300.

So far things appear to be commonplace enough. It is when we come to the other side of the account that the remarkable features, with which the Secretary of State desires us to be impressed, are to be detected. We gather from his speech that after the Budget estimate was arrived at the expedition to Chitral brought a charge of 160 lakhs of rupees on the revenue of India, the contribution to the famine fund was increased by 53 lakhs of rupees, the revision of the cotton duties entailed a "loss" of about 26 lakhs of rupees, and 40 lakhs of rupees were repaid to the provincial Governments, constituting in the whole an addition of some 280 lakhs of rupees to the expenditure which was budgeted for. And inasmuch as the increase on the Budget expenditure given by the accounts is only put at Rx. 500,100, there must have been effected in some direction, a reduction of the contemplated expenditure to the extent of no less than Rx. 2,300,000. Some of this, we are told, was due to considerable saving on the ordinary expenditure of the army, and some to savings in other branches of expenditure, but by far the greater portion, namely Rx. 1,665,000 was the result of a diminution of the "loss by exchange." This means that the rupee expenditure in respect of the English charges had been originally estimated on the basis of an average exchange rate of 13·09d. the rupee, or 18·335rs. per £ sterling, whereas the Government had in fact been able to meet them by an average expenditure of 17·54rs. per £ (=13·68d. the rupee); and consequently the rupee expenditure on this account had been reduced by the above named amount, *i.e.*, Rx. 1,665,000 below the estimate.

The Secretary of State's short comment on these two years is:

"Thus we see in one year a loss in exchange very largely diminished by a saving in expenditure, and in the next year we see a gain in exchange greatly enhanced by further savings, so as to cover very large unexpected disbursements."

And afterwards, having admitted that the market price of silver is the dominant factor in the exchange value of the rupee, he goes on to say,

"What I wish to impress on the House is that owing to the speculative and gambling character of the exchange value (!) the Indian Finance Minister finds its almost impossible for him to foretell how it will operate in any particular financial year, and the expenditure can only be met by a margin of revenue or by financial or taxable reserves capable of immediate realization. In these circumstances we have to ask ourselves what taxable resources we have that are not now in operation."

And the answer which he himself at once gives to this question is that we have none.

So far, then, from the figures of the Secretary of State tending to convey the favourable impression,

against which he warned the House of Commons, the only reasonable inference that we can draw from his exposition of the accounts is, that the Budget of the Indian Government is a practically useless proceeding, that the annual adjustment of its finances is little better than a hand-to-mouth affair, and that what with the uncertainty as to the opium return on the one hand and the capricious variations of exchange on the other, coupled with the absence of taxable resource in reserve, the task of the Indian Finance Minister is essentially chance work, and ought not to be made the subject of close examination.

As a matter of fact no reasonable opportunity for debate was afforded the House of Commons. And both the Secretary of State and Sir H. Fowler used language which seemed to imply that the curiosity of honourable members interested in the affairs of India ought to be satisfied with the completeness of the Indian Financial Statement in their hands and the full report attached thereto of the discussion of the Statement which took place in the Governor-General's Council. But it seems to have escaped those honourable gentlemen that in the Governor-General's Council there could be no effective debate on any matter of policy, and that no attempt was made there to enquire either into the details of the costly Home expenditure, or into the methods by which sterling obligations are discharged. These are by far the most serious ingredients in Indian finance, and it is in the House of Commons alone that they can be fully and adequately dealt with.

Sir William Wedderburn, speaking in support of his amendment, very justly complained on behalf of India that her rulers "neither gave her a voice in her own affairs nor would attend to them themselves." And to outsiders it certainly does not appear to be an altogether unreasonable remedy, as Sir H. Fowler thought it, for such scandal that the Indian Financial Statement elucidated by the reported discussion of it in the Governor-General's Council should pass under the scrutiny of a Committee of the House of Commons before the Secretary of State's resolutions were moved. What would be the more appropriate mode of effecting such scrutiny is, perhaps, a question upon which parliamentary experts may have a good deal to say. But some practical solution must be found without delay if confidence is to be won for the financial administration of India!

Sir H. Fowler seems to think everything is explained when he says:—

> "The great increase in net Indian expenditure was attributable in the main to the enormous loss sustained in exchange."

And the Secretary of State evidently viewed this so-called "loss" as so much abstraction of coin from the treasury, or as blackmail levied by some mysterious and unscrupulous agency. It is probable that Sir H. Fowler's words meant no more than this: The great increase in net expenditure beyond the amount estimated for it in the Budget was attributable in the main to the unexpected rise in the rupee cost of articles supplied from home. When thus read a crop of questions suggest themselves.

Were all these things needed?

What was the cause of the unexpected rise of cost?

Could any of the things have been obtained cheaper in India?

etc., etc.

And Sir H. Fowler is satisfied, if his language stops all this enquiry.

It needs hardly to be repeated here that the rate of money exchange obtaining at any time is merely a feature of the state of trade between the two countries—the precious metals having their place among the articles of commerce. And when it is remembered that the amount of the rupee expenditure of the Indian Government on the Home account is approximately one-fourth of the value of the total Indian exports—in other words, that the Indian Government in effect finance one quarter of the export trade of India, it is conceivable that it might, if it took pains to understand the business, manage, if not to obtain some control over its own remittances, at least to avoid being too often the victim of that "unexpected" which is doubtless just as dominant in Indian finance as elsewhere, and not more so.

LAND REVENUE IN MADRAS.

By Professor A. F. Murison, LL.D.

For some time back the question of the administration of the land revenue in Madras has been forcing itself unpleasantly upon attention. In recent numbers of "India" Mr. Rogers discussed the principles of the subject at some length; in the June issue some striking statistics were tabulated, and comment was made upon official shirking of the publication of the facts; and last month's article on "The Alibag Revision Settlement" showed that the fundamental mischief is in active operation elsewhere than in the Madras Presidency. We, therefore, welcome a most opportune and able treatment of the matter in the current (August) number of our rising contemporary the *Madras Review*.

In the Alibag article Sir George Wingate's words of wisdom were quoted as follows:

> "No unnecessary reduction can injure the country, and the Government revenue can only suffer from it to the extent of such reduction. An error upon one side involves the inevitable ruin of the country; an error upon the other some inconsiderable sacrifice of the finances of the State; and with such unequal stakes depending, can we hesitate as to which should be given the preponderance? The line of true policy under

such circumstances is not in an attempt to fix assessment at what the land will exactly bear, but in fixing it as far within this limit as the exigencies of the State will permit."

The writer in the *Madras Review* makes a similar statement of principle in terms that substantially paraphrase the expressions of Sir George Wingate. So obvious is the right course in the circumstances. And this obviousness is the just measure of the official wrongheadedness and perversity.

What is the present situation? We will outline the answer given by the Madras Reviewer. There are three broad groups mainly connected with the land: "The first is the group of agriculturists who formed the military and dominant classes, now amounting to 2,320,288, or 6·51 per cent. of the entire population; next the old, cultivating or farmer class, now amounting to 7,016,140, or 19·61 per cent.; and the field labourers, amounting to 7,066,838, 19·75 per cent., according to the Census of 1891." These classes competed keenly for the residue of the produce left by Government—half the net produce left after the estimated expenses of cultivation. So the dominant class "had to reduce their standard of living, or increase if possible the rent from the farmer, who in his turn had either to reduce the wages of his agricultural labourers or dispense with their services, and himself labour in the fields." The distress was intensified by the influx of "a large proportion of hill and forest tribes, trading, shepherd, toddy-drawing, and other classes"—"not less than many millions of people"—into agriculture, mainly in consequence of the rigour of the forest and akbari laws and to the competition of English manufacturers.

"The struggle for land is thus intensified year after year. Old industries are gone or decaying, and new industries are not springing up. The decay of our industries lets loose on agriculture another large flood of comparatively alien population. The scramble for land becomes intense. The old agricultural and cultivating landholder finds himself unable to pay the assessment which the eager bid of a large class of people convinces the not over-sympathetic revenue official that the land could well bear. He has accordingly to reduce himself to the level of a coolie proprietor of land under Government, satisfying himself with an income from land equal to a minimum living wage, and be content with the standard of comfort of the class of labourers. Where he cannot so reduce himself to a level of life his ancestors and himself have not been accustomed to, he is sold up for arrears of revenue or he relinquishes his land to Government, and the land is taken up, whatever the assessment might be, by one who has accustomed himself to a much lower standard of life, and who hopes therefore to pay the Government assessment. If he again is mistaken in his calculations and fails to pay the Government revenue, he also relinquishes the land, or is sold up in his turn, and a more sanguine coolie speculator steps in, with the same result. If the cultivator is able to pay the revenue by improving the land, by investing his own money on it, or otherwise, that is itself accepted as an indication of the lightness of the assessment, with the result that the assessment is soon increased. No law stands between the rayat and the revenue official. No Civil Court may enquire into the question of any increase of taxation. He has therefore to lower again his standard of life, or to relinquish or submit to the sale of the land. The revenue official flourishes in the face of the world the fact that the lands are seldom unoccupied, that every land relinquished is soon taken up, forgetful of the circumstance that where land is the only means of livelihood for by far the great majority of the population, every bit of land, if possible, will find an occupant.

If this goes on for some time, what, asks the reviewer, are we likely to find? His very reasonable answer is this: "A great mass of *half-starved*, wretched, small peasant proprietors, heavily in debt, their numbers gradually increasing; a natural general degradation in the character of the people; and an entire divorce between land on the one hand and capital and intelligence on the other." The last-mentioned anticipation has, in fact, already been officially admitted as realised. "It is so rare," said Lord Wenlock in a recent address, "that it is almost unknown, to see any man of culture and education devoting his time, his leisure, or his wealth to personal pursuit of this particular industry"—an industry that he had just described as "by far the most important industry in the present condition of the country." How shall such administrative results be adequately characterised?

There is another way of looking at the subject. The cultivable land lying waste is of the enormous extent of over six millions of acres; the table on page 180 (India, June) gives the figures 6,992,817, and the Madras Revenue Board admits 6,392,689. Now this means more than one-fifth and little less than one-fourth of the whole cultivable area. Here is a disastrous aspect of affairs, surely. Mr. Rogers says, and the Reviewer agrees with him, that the responsibility for the non-cultivation of a great part of this waste land lies upon the revenue system. The Bombay settlements, on the other hand, have been very effective in bringing waste under cultivation. What does the Madras Revenue Board say? Of course, the case looks bad, but the revenue system cannot be to blame; and a rate of assessment in Madras similar to the generally lighter Bombay rate might have had a similar effect, only it "could only have been purchased by a large sacrifice of revenue." "If this had proceeded from an opponent, and not from the members of the Board," says the reviewer, "we should have deemed it incredible."

Let us now look at the lands actually under cultivation. Two-thirds—66·22 per cent.—of the pattas pay less than 10 rupees a year; 89·27 per cent. pay less than 30 rupees. The 66 per cent. number over 2,000,000. But while 1,459,753 of the pattas are registered in single names, 564,330 are joint pattas issued in the names of 1,735,486 registered rayats. Now suppose each registered rayat represents a family of four persons—husband, wife,

and two children. The 3,195,239 registered rayats thus represent a population of 12,780,956. Now the official history of "Progress of the Madras Presidency during the last Forty Years," on which we recently commented, calculates that, if nine rupees a month will keep a rayat's family according to the existing standard, eight acres of ordinary land paying a tax of 14 rupees, or a proportionately larger area of inferior land paying a like tax, may be taken as the area that a family must cultivate in order to subsist. On this official assumption, then, here are 12,780,956 people—more than one-third of the total population (including the towns and the Zemindaris)—leading "a life of semi-starvation." The number of rayats that pay from 10 to 14 rupees is not accessible from the statistics, but clearly it would make a very considerable addition to the 12,780,956. "There is thus no doubt that the great majority of what the Government are pleased to call peasant proprietors holding land under them are paupers leading a life of misery and starvation."

At this stage we may present the reviewer's summary of the points taken by Mr. Rogers:

"Mr. Rogers remarked upon the large number of coercive processes as indicating the oppressive nature of the land revenue and the rigour of its collection. It appeared that during the three years 1887-88 to 1889-90 notices of attachment of property had to be issued to 917,955 defaulters, and during those years more than 87,000 acres of land, in addition to moveable property which realised Rs. 2,76,611, have been sold to realise the arrears which amounted to Rs. 8,50,413. The number of defaulters was 64,435. In the eleven years 1879-80 to 1889-90 there were sold for arrears of land revenue 1,963,364 acres of land held by 840,713 defaulters, in addition to personal property of the value of Rs. 29,65,018. Of the land sold, nearly 60 per cent could not find purchasers, and had to be bought in by Government."

Mr. Rogers's letters were placed before the Government of Madras early in 1893. The reply of the Government was communicated to the Secretary of State in February, 1896! The public, however, as yet can only judge of the tenor of the reply from the Government remarks on the proceedings of the Board of Revenue in concocting it. The reviewer deals in drastic fashion with subordinate elements of the case, and then he lays his axe at the root of the matter:

"Now, coming to the main issue, how are the sales for arrears of revenue to be accounted for, except on the assumption that the assessment is too heavy for the rayat to pay? How is the purchase of a good portion of these lands by Government for want of bidders to be accounted for, except on the ground that not even a speculative coolie rayat could be found to undertake the cultivation on the terms demanded by Government?"

The Board postulates that the money value of one half of the net produce "is by no means an impossible rent," and, for the rest, the upshot is that "all these sales, and the ruin of the rayat, is caused solely by the inefficiency and neglect of duty on the part of the officials of Government." On this the reviewer comments as follows:

"The exigencies of a weak case have driven the Board very far indeed! To avoid the natural and inevitable conclusion that the assessments are too heavy, they 'postulate' the matter in issue, and invent a series of facts to justify the same. They have to call the rayats an unthrifty race, and all Government officials, from the Collector downwards, inefficient for their prime duty! Having gone on the track, the Board had to go further. It had to account for the re-purchase of the lands for want of bidders, and the solution is equally simple. The rayats had all combined against Government. The Brahmin, Muhammadan, Christian, and all other classes have formed a clique to let Government take away valuable lands so that they may rob it! It is, furthermore, incredible that men will allow their landed property worth Rs. 7,15,612 to be sold for Rs. 1,55,762 if it were possible for them to pay the revenue. We need not attempt to expose this fallacy further. The Board could not have satisfied itself of the truth of these wholesale charges, which we have no hesitation in condemning as unfair both to the people and the officials who have no opportunity of refuting them."

What, then, is the remedy prescribed by the Board of Revenue?

"Enforced rigour in collection. Of course, if pressure is brought to bear on the rayat, he will probably pay, but it will be the sowcar's money. His present indebtedness is acknowledged, and agricultural banks, etc., are proposed for his relief. But where will be their use till we remove the main cause of his indebtedness?"

Those of us who are accustomed to speak in glowing terms of English administration in India may be recommended to make a special study of this question. The facts are lamentable, and indisputable. Why, in the name of common sense, should it be possible for an able and esteemed American missionary to say, openly and without contradiction: "Whenever I move about among the rayats, at harvest time, I often have the impression as if all are united to ruin the poor landholder"? This, too, when the Governor is publicly declaring that agriculture "is by far the most important industry in the present condition of the country, and on its prosperity depends the prosperity of others."

FRESH COMPLICATIONS WITH THE AFGHANS.

By J. DACOSTA.

An article printed in the *Times* of September 8th, under the heading "The Last Gap in the Indo-Afghan Frontier," informed us that news had just been received in India of a considerable force of Afghan militia having occupied the Mittai valley in Bajaur, and that our reading of the Durand agreement justified us in saying that Mittai falls to India. The article stated further:—

"The Khans of Dir and Nawagai (against whom the ruler

of Afghanistan would have to act) are well-proved allies of the Indian Government and . . . . rendered excellent service during the Chitral campaign and since. The latter is directly menaced by the Afghan descent into the Mittai valley. . . . . Obviously it would not be to our advantage to let him think that the Amír of Afghanistan is a more powerful neighbour than the Government of India."

We have therefore intimated to the Amír that we regard this encroachment on Bajaur as an infraction of the Durand agreement, and have proposed the appointment of another joint delimitation Commission. An immediate settlement of the difference is called for.

The questions involved in this controversy may be elucidated by a retrospective survey of our previous relations with Abdur Ráhman.

In November, 1878, during the reign of Amír Shere Ali, three British armies simultaneously invaded Afghanistan on the plea that its occupation by British troops was necessary for the defence of our Indian territories against a Russian invasion. Shere Ali having died the following year, Abdur Ráhman, who had retired into Turkestan, claimed the Amírship as grandson of Dost Mahomed, the former ruler. Kabul and Kandahar were then held by our invading armies, and we invited the chiefs of the Afghan tribes to confer with us regarding the future government of their country. But they declined our invitation and began to prepare for a *jehád* or religious war for the expulsion or extermination of the *Káfar*, *i.e.*, the British. We then proposed to Abdur Ráhman to recognise him as Amír, offering him the friendship and support of the British Government, on condition of his relinquishing his claim to the Herat and Kandahar territories. He accepted the proffered friendship, but distinctly intimated that he claimed the entire kingdom which his grandsire had ruled. "I have been chosen," he said, "by the people of Afghanistan to protect the country in the name of Islam against all infidel encroachments." (Sir Lepel Griffin's article, *Fortnightly Review*, December, 1893).

Meanwhile the British force which held Kandahar was attacked and partially destroyed at Maiwand by Ayub Khan, a cousin of Abdur Ráhman and a rival claimant of the throne of Afghanistan. The prospect of our saving the remainder of that force, which was closely besieged in Kandahar, by sending to its relief a portion of the army we had at Lahore, seemed remote in view of the distance between the two cities and of the numerous hostile tribes who occupied the intermediate country. We explained our difficulties to Abdur Ráhman, and he consented, on certain conditions, to use his influence to restrain the tribes in question from attacking the relief force we might send from Kabul. Under those conditions we paid a million of rupees, we pledged ourselves to refund the treasure seized by us during our occupation of Kabul, we renounced the fine which we had imposed on its inhabitants for conniving at the murder of the British Envoy, we surrendered the guns which were not wanted by our relief force, and we undertook to evacuate Afghan territory with all practicable diligence. The fulfilment of these conditions, the relief of our Kandahar garrison, and the return of our forces to India, brought our Afghan campaign to a close, and our subsequent policy towards the Afghans was, for a time, tempered by Lord Roberts's opinion, as expressed in his despatch of May 29th, 1880, in which he said:

"Should Russia in future years attempt to conquer Afghanistan or invade India through it, we should have a better chance of attaching the Afghans to our interests if we avoid all interference with them in the meantime."

Suddenly in the summer of 1885 our aggressive policy was revived with a change in our tactics, obviously suggested by the utter failure which had attended our previous Afghan wars. On those occasions we entered Afghanistan at the head of a victorious army, but could neither maintain ourselves there nor retire with honour. The new scheme aimed, therefore, at the subjugation of the border-tribes and the construction of military roads through their territories, in order to secure our communications with India when we penetrated into the heart of the country. For these purposes our Indian army was at once materially increased, and some twenty expeditions were employed, from 1885 to 1895, in attempts to subjugate the Afghan tribes dwelling on the other side of the N.-W. frontier of British India. Those military operations, however, failed to accomplish their main object. In 1890 Sir Robert Sandeman succeeded, by negotiations and money-grants, in obtaining the consent of some tribal chiefs in the Zhob Valley to our establishing a post at Apozai. But the tribesmen repudiated the bargain and constantly harassed our garrison. We strongly remonstrated with the Amír in respect of these annoyances, which we represented in the light of raids committed on British soil; whereupon the Amír enquired as to the actual position of our frontier, seeing that in all our maps the boundary of British India was marked by a red line running along the course of the Indus, that is, at a considerable distance from the scene of the alleged raids. Our reply to the Amír's question is not known to the public. The incident led to acrimony and loud threats on our part, and ultimately resulted in the Durand agreement, on the interpretation of which our present controversy with the Amír has arisen. Whether the reading of that agreement, as stated by the writer of the article in the *Times* of September 8th, is a correct reading, the public have no means of judging, the text of the agreement having been kept secret for upwards of two years and only

recently published in its original form, without the several alterations subsequently made in its terms being indicated. On November 18th, 1894, the *Times* contained a telegram from its Calcutta Correspondent saying:

"The Amír has agreed to consider Chitral, Bajaur, Swat and the neighbouring States of Indus Kohistan, as without the sphere of his influence."

This, however, is merely an irresponsible interpretation of a text to which the public has not access. We cannot, therefore, ascertain its accuracy.

As regards the probability of the Bajaur controversy leading to war between us and Afghanistan, it is not unreasonable to expect that the Amír will consent to make some concessions rather than invalidate an agreement which secures to him a subsidy of 1,800,000 rupees a year. But a more complete view of the situation is obtained when we bear in mind the respective motives by which the two Governments are actuated in their dealings with each other. The settled policy of the British is to exercise dominion over Afghanistan, professedly for the defence of our Indian possessions against Russia. Such dominion, however, can be obtained only when Afghanistan has been conquered, and is securely held, by British troops. The Amír's policy, on the other hand, is to protect the country of the Afghan tribes against the encroachments of all infidels. From that duty, which he accepted solemnly, as he fearlessly proclaimed to us, he is not likely to recede, since by receding he would at once forfeit sovereignty, life, and all that is dear to him in the world. From these premises it seems safe to conclude that, whatever be the immediate outcome of the Mittai valley incident, a collision and a struggle between the two parties—the one striving for supremacy, the other for independence—cannot long be delayed. Accordingly both parties seem intent upon preparing to meet that contingency.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

The annual dinner of the London Indian Society, held at the Holborn Restaurant on September 4th, was a brilliant success. The date was fixed by the birthday of the President, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, who was born in Bombay, on September 4th, 1825, and who received a remarkable ovation both from the members of the Society and from the many Englishmen who were present. Unfortunately neither Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., nor Mr. A. O. Hume was able to attend. Letters were read from them, and from Mr. H. J. Reynolds, Mr. Herbert Roberts, M.P., Mr. Wadia, and Mr. Seymour Keay. A novel feature in the dinner was a course of "national Indian dishes," which added considerably to the warmth of the proceedings.

Mr. Naoroji, proposing the first toast, "The Empress of India and the Royal Family," said Her Majesty's great proclamation of 1858 was a landmark of civilisation as well as a landmark in the history of India. It was the hope and anchor of the people, and if the expectations raised by it had been disappointed it was the fault of the Executive, and not of the Sovereign. (Cheers.) Mr. W. S. Caine, asking his hearers to drink to "India and the Indian National Congress," said he would soon pay his fourth visit to India in order to be present for the third time at the Congress, where he was to represent the British Committee. No influence during the last ten years could be compared with that of the Congress, for it had drawn Englishmen and Indians together in bonds of union and sympathy to a marvellous extent. (Cheers.) The first time he visited India the Anglo-Indian newspapers were full of abuse of the Congress, but now their tone was entirely different. The feeling here also had changed, in consequence of the work of the British Committee of the Congress, which had set itself to permeat the press with the truth concerning the just aspirations of India for a share in her own government. (Cheers.) Knowing, however, that the battle would have to be fought in this country, he regretted that the number of members of the House of Commons willing to help India had fallen from 185 in the last Parliament to 120 at present, but he believed that the figure would rise again at the next general election. (Cheers.)

Mr. K. A. Ghaswalla, vice-president of the Society, responded, indignantly repudiating the suggestion that because Indians demanded a share in their own government they were disloyal. "We Indians," he said, "are one nation." Mr. H. N. Haridas, who also replied, declared that the friends of India had convinced disinterested public opinion in this country that with regard to the cotton duties the interests of poor India had been sacrificed by the present Government for the sake of an electioneering triumph.

Among the most notable speeches of the evening were Mr. Naoroji's (in reply to the toast of his health), Professor A. F. Murison's (replying for the guests), and Dr. Moncure D. Conway's. Mr. Naoroji, who declared that he had not a harsh word to say of Englishmen, was evidently touched by the spontaneous demonstration of gratitude and goodwill which he received. His sincerity, his earnestness, and his perseverance were the theme of every speaker, and the Grand Old Man of India beamed with honest, and touching, pride. Professor Murison, citing the example of Prince Ranjitsinhji and others, said that the royal road to an Englishman's respect was to beat him at something. Dr. Conway delivered an eloquent and thoughtful speech on the debt of European nations to Oriental philosophy and asceticism. The other speakers included Mr. W. Martin Wood, Mr. H. Morgan-Browne, Mr. H. Budruddin Tyabji, Mr. T. J. Desai, and Mr. Syed Z. A. Balkhi.

The Blue-book promised by the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure still remains to be issued. It was laid in "dummy" on the Table of the House of Commons before the prorogation, and was expected

to be in members' hands before the end of August. The volume will, it is anticipated, contain some important documents on financial subjects in addition to the first section of the evidence.

We understand that Sir Charles Elliott will contribute to the October number of the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* an article upon "Executive and Judicial Powers in India." From the tone of Sir Charles's previous declarations upon this subject, it may perhaps be inferred that his article will be of value chiefly to his opponents. Dr. K. N. Bahadurji will contribute to the same number an article upon "The Medical Needs of India."

The volume in which the Czar records the impressions of his Eastern travels contains a passage which, in the opinion of the *Daily News* reviewer, might have been written by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji. Discussing the condition of Western India, the Czar writes:—

"Formerly money used, at times, to be exacted beyond all measure from the population, but it remained in India; now the taxation is seemingly lighter and more humane, yet the wealth of the country is slowly failing, or being transferred to foreign lands, which draw the life-blood from the passive East, flooding it with the worst products of their industry, and slowly undermining the general prosperity of the natives, who to the superficial eye seem to be happy and contented, and preserved from their former internecine disturbances. Let me illustrate this by an example. The Gaekwar of Baroda, when occupying a more independent position, used annually to purchase from Ahmedabad some £80,000 worth of silk and cloth alone. From the time that the splendour of this Maratha prince began to fade the Merchants of Gujarat found themselves losing ground. Some of the cleverest artisans remain quite without work, or earn only a bare pittance."

We understand that Miss C. S. Bremner, whose name is familiar to readers of India, is at present engaged upon a work dealing with the education of women and girls in Great Britain. The book is to be published by Messrs. Swan Sonnenschein this autumn. Strange to say, the field is unoccupied, no such work having yet been attempted. Miss Bremner deals with primary, secondary, higher, and "technico-professional" education. Mr. G. Alexander and Miss Jane Galloway, of Glasgow, will be responsible for the chapter on Scottish education, and Miss E. P. Hughes, of the Cambridge Training College, will contribute the preface.

In the School of Modern Oriental Studies at the Imperial Institute the successful candidates for the Ouseley scholarships for 1896 were as follows: Burmese, Lee Ah Yain; Arabic, G. Sarwar; Marathi, V. R. Pandit. Three Ouseley scholarships of £50 per annum, tenable for two years, will be awarded in July next, should sufficient merit be shown, for proficiency in Tamil, Persian, and Chinese. In the event of there being no candidates for any of these subjects, Gujarati will be substituted. The limits of age for competitors are 21–25.

"There was trouble at the India Office last week," wrote the *St. James's Gazette* on September 15th. "It was feared at one time that the Secretary of State's Council would be unable to meet on Wednesday. Lord George Hamilton, who is President by virtue of his post, is, of course, away; but it is customary for the Vice-President to remain within hail. Sir Alfred Lyall, however, who is Vice-President for the year, had gone into the country, trusting that enough members were left in town to form the necessary quorum. Then Field-Marshal Sir Donald Stewart went on the sick-list, and the prospects of a meeting grew extremely doubtful. A telegram was sent to Sir Alfred Lyall begging him to come back; but he declared it was out of the question, and the Clerk of the Council, Sir Horace Walpole, was in despair. As a last resource, Sir Charles Crosthwaite, who is taking the regulation holiday, was appealed to, and not in vain. He returned, not perhaps with cheerful alacrity, but in time for the meeting. Strong opinions are expressed on the grave inconvenience that may arise from reducing the number of Councillors without at the same time reducing the quorum." A more excellent way, we suggest, would be to abolish the India Council altogether as an obsolete and unprofitable institution.

We should like to draw the attention of our readers to the publication of the *Progressive Review*, the first number of which appeared on September 25th. The Review is established, we learn, to secure an effective presentation, and a vigorous and rational defence of modern progressive thought, particularly in the sphere of politics. "The promoters feel that the inadequacy of the support given at present to movements aiming at social and political reform is largely due to the fact that these movements, owing to the rise of new problems in politics and economics, are but imperfectly explained and understood. The Review will not be a party organ, but will confine itself to a statement and defence of the principles which must now guide the progressive movement, and will examine how far and by what means they can be applied to existing social conditions. The articles will therefore deal with the fundamental principles of democratic government and of industrial development as well as with the chief matters of current public interest." We trust that Indian questions will receive adequate attention in the pages of this enterprising publication.

If the *Times* cannot boast "the largest circulation in the world" it can, perhaps, claim the most unique. The following is from a recent issue:

"The Circulation of the 'Times'.—A correspondent has received from India the following extract from the *Englishman* of Calcutta, dated August 14, 1896, and sends it to us for publication: 'The sailors of the ship "Somali" when off the Cape of Good Hope the other day caught a shark—a fine specimen, and on opening it up, as is the custom amongst seafaring men, discovered a complete copy of the *Times* in the brute's body.'"

This incident may be said to demonstrate anew the shark's capacity to swallow (if not to digest) anything.

The "India," the latest and finest addition to the Peninsular and Oriental fleet, arrived in the Thames on September 17th, after a trial trip, in which the highest expectations of the builders and owners are said to have been fully realised. The steamer touching at Plymouth on her way south, some of the guests left her there. Amongst the larger portion proceeding to London were Lord Davey, Sir Francis Jeune, Mr. John Aird, M.P., Sir Andrew Scoble, M.P., Sir Edward Hill, M.P., Sir Andrew Clarke, Mr. Carson, M.P., and Sir Wemyss Reid.

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of INDIA cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

INDIA presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, OCTOBER, 1896.

INDIA IN PARLIAMENT, 1896.

COMMENTING on Mr. Hanbury's motion of March 14th last year, to the effect that the military appropriations in aid paid by India were excessive and unjust, the *Globe* wrote: "The present Parliamentary Session ought to be favourably recorded "by the future historian as that in which the "British conscience first began to show uneasiness "about 'injustice to India'." This unexpected tribute to the growing importance of Indian questions in the House of Commons was not, of course, strictly accurate. Even before 1895 the "British conscience," stimulated by the energy of a handful of independent members, had begun to regard an Indian debate as something other than a nuisance or a soporific. The same stimulus has been at work during the Session which ended a few weeks ago. The Indian Parliamentary Committee, which now consists of 120 members of the House of Commons, has not, indeed, accomplished all that it proposed. Still less has it achieved all that the taxpayers of India could desire. It has not brought the Front Benches to admit the overwhelming importance of the demands put forward by educated opinion in India, nor has it, in every case, successfully enforced its equitable objections to the policy proposed by the Government. But, in the teeth of obstacles that cannot be fully appreciated by anybody who is not familiar with the inside of the House of Commons, it has done an immense amount of useful work, and work, too, which, but for its spontaneous efforts, would never have been attempted. The initiative and persistence of Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., loyally supported by the colleagues who have enrolled themselves as members of his gallant force, have secured for the voteless taxpayers of India a hearing in Parliament, and an opportunity of protest and remonstrance, on many important occasions during the past Session. In the House of Commons there have been no fewer than five debates on questions of vital importance to India. Three of these debates were brought on solely by the good offices of the Indian Parliamentary Committee, while its members contributed to the other discussions speeches which, from the standpoint of the Indian taxpayers, were of unique importance and value. The Parliamentary Report which is issued month by month as a Supplement to "INDIA" contains, for the past Session, no fewer than 111 closely printed pages. Mere volume of discussion is, of course, neither here nor there. But no candid reader of these Reports will deny that substantial issues have been raised, or that the great bulk of the non-official speeches are to be placed to the credit of the Indian Parliamentary Committee. Nor was it only in the longer debates that Sir W. Wedderburn and his colleagues rendered useful service. From the beginning of the Session to its close they did not cease to cross-examine the Secretary of State by means of Parliamentary questions, and to secure publicity for important facts through the medium of Parliamentary Papers. The attention which Parliament devotes to Indian affairs is still ludicrously inadequate alike in amount and in kind. But if the Indian Parliamentary Committee were not in existence, or, being in existence, were less vigilant, the neglect of India by Parliament would be far grosser even than it is.

The first important debate of the Session took place on February 17th, on Sir W. Wedderburn's amendment to the Address. The Queen's Speech announced that the measures taken last year to secure an effective control over Chitral had been successful. Sir W. Wedderburn proposed to add to the address in reply an expression of regret that the Government, reversing the policy of its predecessors, had decided not to withdraw from Chitral. The policy of retention, his amendment declared, violated the pledge expressly given by Lord Elgin, while it added dangerously to the trans-frontier responsibilities of the Government of India and the military

burdens of the Indian people. The amendment, which was seconded by Mr. Schwann, and supported in the division-lobby by 79 votes, provoked a remarkable speech from Lord George Hamilton. The Secretary of State actually declared that the only difficulty in regard to Lord Elgin's proclamation had arisen from the inconvenient anxiety of the native tribes to be incorporated in British territory. Perhaps he had forgotten this precious assertion when he said on August 13th that the relations between our officers and troops and the tribes were "steadily improving." Not less important was the discussion on Lord G. Hamilton's readjustment of the cotton duties, which Sir W. Wedderburn, by means of a motion for the adjournment of the House, succeeded in obtaining on May 18th. Before the debate came on the Indian Parliamentary Committee had circulated among members of Parliament a concise memorandum explaining the grounds of complaint and proposing a simple and effective remedy. Sir W. Wedderburn's motion, which was supported by nearly all the members of the Opposition with the exception of ex-Ministers, stated that the cotton duties, as re-arranged by Lord G. Hamilton, were causing grave dissatisfaction in India because they increased the burden of taxation imposed upon the poorest classes of consumers. Sir Henry Fowler made himself conspicuous in the discussion by an amazing attack upon the independent members of his own party, and something very like a defence of the Tory Minister who had first denounced and afterwards reversed his policy. If anything were needed to heighten the eccentricity of Sir H. Fowler's conduct on that occasion it would be found in the fact, subsequently disclosed in his speech on the Indian Budget, that he was nevertheless substantially in accord with the proposal put forward by the Indian Parliamentary Committee. The third debate for which Sir W. Wedderburn and his colleagues were immediately responsible had to do with the deposition of the Mahárájá of Jhalawar. On July 21st, Mr. Herbert Roberts asked and obtained leave to move the adjournment of the House in order to call attention to the Mahárájá's treatment at the hands of the Indian Government, and the unsatisfactory character of the enquiry into his case. It is interesting and instructive to note that the opportunity for these three debates—which undoubtedly made a useful impression on the House of Commons and the India Office—had to be obtained by their authors. The retention of Chitral, the inequitable readjustment of the cotton duties, and the condemnation of the Mahárájá of Jhalawar without trial would have been allowed to pass uncriticised, and Indian public opinion would have found no expression at Westminster, if the members of the Indian Parliamentary Committee had not gone out of their way, in the teeth of many difficulties and discouragements, to create the occasion for discussion.

The two remaining debates of first-rate importance concerned the employment of Indian troops at Suakin (July 6th) and the Indian Budget (August 13th). The debate, and the preliminary questions, upon the "masterpiece of melancholy meanness," by which the indigent taxpayers of India were compelled to contribute to the cost of aggression in the Sudan, did not call for special activity on the part of the Indian Parliamentary Committee only because Mr. John Morley and others threw themselves with admirable vigour into the contest for justice and fair dealing. Mr. John Morley and his coadjutors were unsuccessful. But the Government's majority was reduced to eighty-five, and the Government would have been placed in a minority if the Cabinet had not staked its existence on the result of the division. The storm of indignation which the policy of Lord Salisbury and his colleagues excited in the House of Commons and in the country is a sufficient guarantee that this particular type of meanness will not be attempted again by any Government. The debate on the Indian Budget was examined at length in our last issue. This is the one opportunity automatically provided each year for the discussion of Indian questions. How absurdly inadequate it is Sir W. Wedderburn demonstrates once more in the article which we print on another page. The chief interest of the Budget discussion centred in his proposal to apply, with the necessary changes of detail, to the expenditure of India the methods of scrutiny which have been employed with excellent results in the case of the United Kingdom. It is quite certain that the proposal will be brought forward again at the first opportunity, when Lord George Hamilton and Sir Henry Fowler, if they have any respect for the House of Commons, will not seek to dismiss it with the flimsy irrelevance which they vouchsafed to it last August. Apart from the debates, the Secretary of State was subjected during the recent Session to a running fire of questions on many matters which have attracted attention in India. Among these may be mentioned the invasion of Kafiristan, the grave blunder of the "forward" school in respect of the Bashgal Valley, the position of British Indian subjects in South Africa, the rate of mortality in Indian prisons, the employment of Indian troops beyond the frontiers, the land revenue system in Madras, the fortification of the Malakand Pass, the right of interpellation, the creation of a Legislative Council for the Punjab, the re-settlements in Jabalpur, and the ravages of contagious disease among British troops in India. In estimating the value of debates and questions on Indian affairs in the House of Commons it is

necessary to take into account not merely the actual results achieved at the moment and in any particular case, but also the deterrent influence which the possibility of such scrutiny exercises upon a bureaucratic Government. "What's done we partly can "compute, But know not what's prevented." The Indian Parliamentary Committee has displayed admirable energy in turning to account the opportunities which are within its reach. But if the electors of the United Kingdom are to do their duty by their fellow-subjects in India, the opportunities of Parliamentary criticism will have to be improved and increased.

ANGLO-INDIAN CRIMINAL CASES.[1]

THE first edition of this volume brought upon the author the distinction of a severe snub from Sir Charles Elliott, then Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal. The Anglo-Indian Press endorsed the snub, and made merry over the victim. Probably, however, as usually happens in such cases, the effect was to help the author materially to sell off his first edition, and to give bold advertisement to the work and to its contents. It is easy to understand why officials of the Government of India should not like to see any aspersion cast upon the administration of justice. Obviously, however, it is not the compiler of cases of miscarriage of justice that is to blame. The blame must lie on the officials implicated. Babu Ram Gopal disclaims expressly "the smallest idea of "reflecting upon the character of Englishmen in "India as a class, or of traducing the Government "which has conferred such great benefits upon the "people of India." There is nothing to show that his disclaimer is in the slightest degree insincere. But even if it were—even if Babu Ram Gopal were a mischief-maker and detractor pure and simple—the essential point still would be, Does he state the actual facts? If he adheres to the actual facts, then he undoubtedly does good service.

Whatever may be the grounds for the complaint that in questions—and especially in criminal cases—between Europeans and Indians the administration did, or does, lean to the side of the European, it has certainly been a complaint made, and strongly made, by men who cannot be called irresponsible.

"It was made," says Babu Ram Gopal, "by Hurrish Chunder Mookerjee; it was repeated by Kristo Dass Pal; it is emphasised by men upon whom their mantle has fallen, by Indian journalists of all shades of religious and political opinion, by men like Sambhoo Chunder Mookerjee, Shishir Kumar Ghose, Narendra Nath Sen, and Surendra Nath Banerjea."

There is no good in telling us that such an outcry would be made apart from all reasonable grounds, and out of mere devilry. But the complaint once made, and once taken up by the public, the only sensible course seems to be to set forth the facts. "It was suggested so far back as 1883, in the first "National Congress that ever was held, that those "cases should be put together in the form of a book, "and an appeal made, on the strength of them, to "the consciences of the British people." The suggestion was manifestly practical and businesslike. But this collection of Babu Ram Gopal's does not—could not possibly—appear under the authorisation of the National Congress. It is a private venture. Besides, its incompleteness is attributed—not altogether properly—by the compiler to his grievous lack of means. This is a pity, of course. The thing was worth doing, and therefore it was worth doing well. But we are not satisfied that Babu Ram Gopal, with all his industry and earnestness, was the right man to do it.

The Babu, we take it, is not a trained lawyer. That seems to us an all but insuperable disqualification. The compiler of such a book as this ought to be able to appreciate precisely the legal points involved in each case, and to strip off all matter that is not strictly relevant to the particular charge, and to set forth every relevant fact available. For example, a competent compiler would hardly allow himself to speak of "accidental murder" in a shooting excursion (p. 120); and, if he cited the general facts from a newspaper paragraph—as the Babu does—he would see the propriety of verifying them, and of stating with equal prominence the course and the results of judicial enquiry—which the Babu does not. The public, who are asked to constitute themselves a Court of Appeal, must be informed of the charge, the facts as given in evidence on both sides, and the verdict and sentence. The Babu falls grievously short in these requirements. This is very unfortunate. The English public are as anxious as the Babu himself that justice, spotless and even-handed, shall be meted out in India. They are willing to listen to him, and to raise their voices against injustice. But it is absolutely futile to place before them mere newspaper paragraphs, or incomplete statements from which they cannot possibly judge one way or another. If the Babu had sensibly excised all such cases as lack elements of cogency, even so much as to raise the slightest suspicion, he would have found space enough for the statement of many cases whose absence from his pages he deplores. The Babu, to put it frankly, must study the elements of legal proof.

The subject is important, far beyond the claims of

[1] "The Record of Criminal Cases, as between Europeans and Natives for the last Hundred Years." Edited and published by Ram Gopal Sanyal. Enlarged second edition. Calcutta: Printed by Sanyal and Co. at the Bharata Mihir Press. 1896. Rs. 2.

the present volume. It is all the more necessary for us to see more particularly what the volume alleges, and how far its allegations are valid. We, at least, shall not be suspected of any desire to shield wrong-doers from righteous exposure and just punishment. At the same time, we can be no parties to reckless accusation, or vague aspersion, however well-meant. What we are concerned to get at is the actual truth in the matter, and the real significance of the truth. Babu Ram Gopal's first instalment of cases stretches from 1807 to 1860. He extracts 30 cases from the defunct *Hurkaru* and the *Friend of India*, and he reprints the late Hon. Kristo Dass Pal's summary of 48 criminal cases from the *Hindu Patriot* of July 31, 1876—in all 78 cases. Now, let us look through the Babu's own 30 cases. They are all admittedly mere newspaper reports, wholly unverified; and even "the blessed *Amrita Bazar Patrika*" is not to be accepted as conclusive evidence of fact. But assuming the facts stated as absolutely true, what do we find? There are a dozen cases of acquittal, on various grounds; and in not a single case is there any fact stated to show why the acquittal was not right. There are half a dozen cases where punishment was awarded in ample measure; and another half dozen where the punishment awarded might be said to be inadequate, if we only knew the facts, but the facts are not given so as to enable us to form any opinion. The rest of the cases are incompletely stated, and ought not to have been printed. On this list, we should decline to say one word against the administration of justice in India. Take two or three examples:

"William Smith was arraigned . . . . for having murdered a woman . . . . but was acquitted on the ground of the unsatisfying nature of the evidence adduced against him."

"James Bedford was tried for slaughtering a native . . . . and was acquitted by the Grand Jury."

"The *Friend of India* . . . . says that Captain Campbell . . . . shot a fisherman. . . . He was acquitted on the plea that he was insane."

A civilian stabs a coolie, according to the *Friend of India*, when temporarily insane. "But," says the Babu, "a correspondent of the *Citizen* described it as a deliberate murder. What became of this case cannot be ascertained from the files of the *Friend*."

To produce such examples as these is enough to ruin the whole collection. To a lawyer, or to any level-headed person, they are utterly ludicrous. Every one of the cases the Babu cites may, indeed, be a gross perversion of justice. We cannot tell. He fails to adduce the facts necessary to satisfy us, or else he leaves the case in such a form as to compel us to decide against him. In the selection given by the late Hon. Kristo Dass Pal, there are some ugly cases certainly. But, for the purposes of the present volume, they are stated in far too condensed a form, and there is no means of testing the numerous assumptions involved in the succinct statement. This portion of Babu Ram Gopal's work seems to us, therefore, completely inefficient for its object.

For the years from 1860 to 1870, there are 17 cases given. The first is the case of John Rudd, who was hanged for shooting an Indian, and Babu Ram Gopal can only complain that an attempt was made to get a reprieve—such an attempt as we are familiar with in England, even in very gross and unquestionable cases of crime. In five or six other cases, in which the sentence is stated, the punishment seems to have been quite adequate. The case of Dawkins, who got six months' rigorous imprisonment "for shooting at and wounding two natives "whose boat fouled his," may seem a travesty of justice, if one were satisfied that the full statement of the facts is contained in the expression "whose "boat fouled his." We cannot join with the Babu in jeering at the plea of self-defence, unless he produce evidence to show its hollowness. Of the other cases we put aside those that are incompletely stated, and the only one that remains with any trace of suspicion about it is the case of Kally Churn (1867). If the Babu's facts be correct and complete, Kally Churn's assailant ought to have been hanged by the neck until dead, and not "honourably acquitted." Yet the very statement of the case tends to throw doubt on its accuracy and completeness.

There are 33 cases from 1870 to 1880. It is a deplorable thing, no doubt, that a Lieutenant-Colonel should have so far forgotten himself as to assault the distinguished novelist, Babu Bunkim Chunder Chatterjee. But the assailant "afterwards "apologized to him," and there was an end of the matter. A case like this ought to find no place in such a collection as the present. Again the Meares (Jessore planter's) case occupies just eight pages. Why? It ended in what the Babu himself calls a "just conviction" before the Magistrate, a conviction that was upheld, as the Babu narrates, by the High Court of Calcutta, and finally by the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal (Sir Richard Temple), on appeal. What more can the Babu, or anybody else, want? There is not, there never was, there never will be, any country in this imperfect world, where such unfortunate occurrences will not take place. But when justice is done, there ought to be an end of the matter. Such a case as this, instead of throwing any aspersion on the administration of justice, glorifies it at every point; and as a mere incident in social life, it tells nothing that might not have been anticipated by the most careless observer of the world. There are two cases where a District Judge and a Sessions Judge are implicated in most regrettable ways. But both of them come disastrously to grief in the due course of justice. True,

the cases suggest a wider prevalence of the like sort of wrong-doing. But the inference is not justifiable; and at any rate justice was substantially meted out. Of course the case of Fuller's syce and Lord Lytton's famous Resolution thereon (1876) are given, and Babu Ram Gopal properly mentions the remonstrance of the High Court of the North-Western Provinces against the Resolution. It is futile to discuss the point afresh, but there can be no hesitation in endorsing Lord Lytton's condemnation of "European masters threatening their Native servants in a manner in which they would not treat "men of their own race." The case, however, show the Government passionately interested in justice to the Native. The like remarks apply to the Kuka executions and the Governor-General's condemnatory Resolution thereon (1872). In this division of the book there are perhaps half-a-dozen cases of real importance, which ought to be set out fully: the Sylhet case (1872), the Stevens case (1875), the Pleader's ear-pulling case in Sylhet (1877), the Fenuah case (1877), Dookha Guri's case (1877), and the Lokenathpore case (1878). In every one of these there are elements that demand exposure.

It is unnecessary to go through the remaining third part of the volume in detail. The conclusions would be precisely similar. The industry and earnestness of Babu Ram Gopal might well be utilised by some editor who understands these things better than the Babu. Incidentally, we may add, the cases furnish evidence against the obnoxious union of executive and judicial functions, and they throw interesting side-lights upon the willing and effective helpfulness of an experienced lawyer like Mr. Manomohan Ghose in circumstances where the unassisted Indian would have undoubtedly suffered grievous injustice. Why is there not some strong association for the investigation and prosecution of such cases of real importance? It is humiliating to think that such an association should be necessary.

WILLIAM MORRIS.[1]

POETRY and wall-papers, chairs and printed books, tapestries and illuminated manuscripts, socialistic speeches and philippics against architectural restoration—diverse indeed are the manifestations of the versatile genius of William Morris. In all of them, however, is to be traced the same intensity of aesthetic feeling, now stimulated and enraptured by some loveliness in nature or art or antiquity, now chafed and fretted by the hideous vulgarity of so much of our boasted civilisation. The ugliness of our modern life seems from the first to have vexed him like a nightmare. He sought relief from it in the art of the Middle Ages, and persuaded himself—not unreasonably, one would think—that the ages that produced such art could not have been so dark as we are apt to suppose. "Time was"—he said in an address delivered at Burslem in 1881, and behind the voice of the disciple we seem to hear the voice of the master, Mr. Ruskin—

> "When everybody that made anything made a work of art besides a useful piece of goods, *and it gave them pleasure to make it*. Whatever I doubt, I have no doubt of that. And, sirs, if there is anything in the business of my life worth doing, if I have any worthy aspiration, it is the hope that I may help to bring about the day when we shall be able to say—'So it was once, so it is now.' Do not misunderstand me; I am not a mere praiser of past times. I know that in those days of which I speak, life was often rough and evil enough, beset by violence, superstition, ignorance, slavery; yet I cannot help thinking that sorely as poor folks needed a solace, they did not altogether lack one, and that solace was pleasure in their work. Ah, sirs, much as the world has won since then, I do not think it has won for all men such perfect happiness that we can afford to cast aside any solace that nature holds forth to us."

In a later address, published in 1888 in "Signs of "Change," we find him saying:

> "As I strove to stir up people to this reform, I found that the causes of the vulgarities of civilisation lay deeper than I had thought, and little by little I was driven to the conclusion that all these uglinesses are but the outward expression of the innate moral baseness into which we are forced by our present form of society, and that it is futile to attempt to deal with them from the outside."

How anyone can be forced into *innate* baseness by any external conditions whatever it is difficult to understand. The mere use of such an expression is enough to suggest the conclusion that Mr. Morris's logical faculty is not as strongly developed as his artistic taste. Or if this seems too brutal a way of putting it, he will at least forgive us for addressing him in the words of another Victorian poet:

> "Not here, O Apollo,
> Are haunts meet for thee,
> But where Helicon breaks down
> In cliff to the sea."

It is not because we would have the singer nothing but "the idle singer of an empty day," that we address him thus. It is because "there are diversities of gifts;" and Mr. Morris has many, far more than most men, but not all. In art, not in political controversy, his genius finds its true scope; and his influence through his art, whatever discouragements he may have met, has been indisputably great and wide.

Mr. Morris's chief poems have now been before the world for a good many years; and it ought to be possible to estimate their value with a greater approach to accuracy than at the time of their

[1] "The Earthly Paradise: A Poem." By William Morris. New Edition. 1896. (London and Bombay: Longmans.)

[1] "The Life and Death of Jason: A Poem." By William Morris. Eighth Edition, revised by the Author. 1896. (Longmans.)

original publication, though the ultimate verdict belongs to posterity, and not to this generation at all. A poet's contemporaries can never fix his place in the final class-list; but, after a reasonable lapse of time, they ought to be able to decide whether he is worthy to be passed on for the re-consideration of posterity or deserves to be buried out of hand. There is little doubt that Mr. Morris, in spite of the length of his epics, which, as the wealth of the world's poetry accumulates, must tell heavily against a poet's chances of immortality, will have to appear before a later tribunal than that of his contemporaries.

The first of his claims to re-consideration will probably be his power of story-telling. He is not uniformly successful; or, perhaps, it were truer to say that he does not suit in every mood. There are times when the strong simplicity, the few swift vivid strokes of the original story of "The Writing "on the Image" in the *Gesta Romanorum* impress us far more forcibly than the linked sweetness long drawn-out of the version in "The Earthly Paradise"; times when we are almost inclined to remind our poet of the French proverb, that the secret of wearying is to tell everything. Yet if we are in the true listener's mood, if (as the vulgar nineteenth-century would say) "time is no object," what a charming story-teller he is! What a wonderful procession of beautiful pictures passes before our eyes in "The Life and Death of Jason," luring us on through all the seventeen books into which he has expanded the "Argonautica" of Apollonius Rhodius! It is curious, by the way, that he should have chosen to adapt the work of this particular poet, and thereby have confirmed, in a sense, a comparison that would inevitably have suggested itself to scholars quite independently. For Apollonius, writing in Alexandria in a literary age, when poetry had become an artificial thing, and poets strove by learned elaboration to reproduce the style of the earlier epics, stood in very much the same relation to Homer as that in which William Morris stands to Chaucer. In each case the imitator fails with all his striving to "recapture the first fine careless "rapture" of his model. But it is easy to press the charge of artificiality too far. No one can read Mr. Morris's "Jason" sympathetically without feeling that he has caught a great deal of the Homeric and Chaucerian quality of "naïf wonder." No one can read "The Story of Sigurd the Volsung" without feeling that he has even caught much of the swiftness and fire and dignity that we have been taught to regard as the Homeric qualities *par excellence*. There is surely the true Homeric ring in such lines as these:—

"And dead he fell, thrust backward, and rang on the dead men's gear,
But still for a certain season durst no man draw anear:
For 'twas e'en as a great God's slaying, and they feared the wrath of the sky,
And they deemed their hearts might harden if awhile they should let him lie."

It is Mr. Morris's language that is most open to the charge of artificiality—his choice of obsolete expressions, his very limited vocabulary (from which nearly all words of classical origin are excluded), his use of fixed epithets, as "wan water." But, these mannerisms notwithstanding, his language seems to be in the main sincere. Nobody would seriously wish to impose the narrow limitations of Mr. Morris's vocabulary on other writers, but to Mr. Morris himself those limitations are perfectly natural. He has made for himself a world out of the old Scandinavian literature, and so completely has he inhaled the atmosphere of the world he has thus created for himself, that he belongs spiritually to that world and not to nineteenth century England. Dante Rossetti, by his sympathy with the times of his great Italian namesake, did something of the same kind for himself. If proof were needed of Mr. Morris's sincerity, it seems to be forthcoming in the fact that, as an American critic, Mr. Stedman, says, his language offers no resisting medium to interfere with our enjoyment of his tales.

But besides his great narrative gift Mr. Morris has another high poetic quality. Through all his verse comes surging "the Virgilian cry, the sense of tears in mortal things." That peculiar touch of pathos has seldom been given better in modern poetry than in these lines from the prologue to "The Earthly Paradise":—

"Sirs, ye are old, and ye have seen perchance
Some little child for very gladness dance
Over a scarcely-noticed worthless thing,
Worth more to him than ransom of a king.
Did not a pang of more than pity take
Your heart thereat, not for the youngling's sake,
But for your own, for man that passes by,
So like to God, so like the beasts that die?—
Lo, Sirs, my pity for myself is such,
When like an image that my hand can touch
My old self grows unto myself grown old.
Sirs, I forget, my story is not told."

Virgil—as Mr. Mackail has said so truly and so well in his history of Latin literature—lived in the world that the Greek and Latin poets had created, but looked out of it into another. It is to that other world, the world of romance, that Mr. Morris wholly belongs. He has "caught the spirit of those "generations," to quote Mr. Stedman again, "which "scarcely emerged from classicism in the South, "and bordered by heathendom on the North, peopled "their unhallowed places with beings drawn from "either source. Christ reigned, yet the old gods had "not wholly faded out, but acted, whether fair or

"devilish, as subjects and allies of Satan." As you read you feel yourself transported into the dim twilight atmosphere of some magical land peopled with phantoms; the air is full of mysterious presences, unseen yet more real and powerful than the shadowy forms of the men and women. For, in truth, "The Earthly Paradise" is like the magic bower in Burne Jones's wonderful pictures of "The "Legend of the Briar Rose." Beauty and colour are there, rich beauty and gorgeous colour, but no life save the life subtly felt, one knows not how, of unseen presences looking on. Over the faces of all the men and women is cast the spell of a lengthy sleep; the air is full of a soundless music that seems to whisper "death"; and the spectator half shudders lest the spell should creep over him too, and he, like the rest, should fade into the shadow of a dream.

"They entered: like a town of ghosts it seemed
To Walter, a beleaguered town of ghosts;
And he felt of them, little though he dreamed
Amid his pain of all the marshalled hosts
That lay there buried mid forgotten boasts:
But dead he seemed, as those his pleasures were,
Dead in a prison vast and void and drear."
—(Walter in Rome—"The Hill of Venus.")

But with his mystical temper Mr. Morris unites a vivid sympathy with Nature, and over against his shadowy pictures of the life of past generations, veiled in an atmosphere of dim romance, we may set his fresh bright living landscapes. The description of the mill in "The Man born to be King" is a good example. The stanzas on the months in "The "Earthly Paradise" have something of the felicity of Shakespeare's peerless sonnets, "Shall I compare "thee to a summer's day?" or "That time of year "thou mayst in me behold."

When all these splendid qualities have been enumerated, there still remains the ungracious but inevitable question, Has Mr. Morris any positive defect that hinders him from taking a really high place, not merely among the poets of his own generation, but among the poets whose work endures the test of time? The sources of strength and weakness often lie close together. Mr. Morris's deep instinct for beauty gives to his verse its peculiar charm, but its exclusive predominance is responsible for the faults of his poetry and of his criticism of life. It produces in the former a cloying excess of sweetness, whilst it renders the latter feeble and hopeless. To him, as to his Wanderers, life is an unsolved riddle:—

"Lo,
A long life gone, and nothing more they know
Why they should live to have desire and foil,
And toil that, overcome, brings yet more toil,
Than that day of their vanished youth, when first
They saw Death clear, and deem'd all life accurst
By that cold overshadowing threat,—the End."

The only advice he has to offer seems to be that contained in the song which Psyche hears sung by mysterious voices:

"Ah, little ones, but if ye could forget
Amidst your outpoured love that you must die,
Then ye, my servants, were death's conquerors yet,
And love to you should be eternity,
How quick soever might the days go by:
Yes, ye are made immortal on the day
Ye cease the dusty grains of time to weigh."

"Forget death, if you can, and enjoy the present." It is not a very noble philosophy; and the poet knows that he cannot take his own advice. The shadow of death broods over all his "Earthly "Paradise"; he cannot forget it. Still less can he face it in the spirit of the great poets and painters, whose most precious gift to us has been this—that they have taught us how to meet death unfalteringly, bestowing upon us a measure of their own high courage and confident calm. Sophocles in his "Oedipus at Colonus," Plato (dramatic artist as well as philosopher) in his "Phaedo," Wordsworth in his "Methought I saw the footsteps of a throne," Mr. G. F. Watts in his "Love and Death," have all a loftier message of the things that pertain unto our peace. And if it should be objected that our demand is too exacting, that poetry has leave to be purely decorative and to offer no criticism of life at all, we may assent willingly, but not to the extent of admitting that the poetry that gives no criticism of life ranks as high as the poetry that teaches and consoles. The art that is to be (in a noble phrase of Mr. J. A. Symonds) "permanent and fresh and "satisfying through a hundred generations, to yield "the bread and wine of daily sustenance for men "and women in successive ages," must be something more than merely decorative. But no juster criticism of Mr. Morris's work has been written than this from his own pen:—

"Of Heaven or Hell I have no power to sing,
I cannot ease the burden of your fears,
Or make quick-coming death a little thing,
Or bring again the pleasure of past years;
Nor for my words shall ye forget your tears,
Or hope again for aught that I can say,
The idle singer of an empty day.

"Dreamer of dreams, born out of my due time,
Why should I strive to set the crooked straight?
Let it suffice me that my murmuring rhyme
Beats with light wing against the ivory gate,
Telling a tale not too importunate
To those who in the sleepy region stay,
Lulled by the singer of an empty day."

What need is there of a graver indictment or a more winning apology?

The Royal Commission on the Financial Relations between Great Britain and Ireland recently issued their final report. Indian readers will not fail to note the methods which have been adopted in order to estimate relative capacity to bear taxation, and may well apply these methods, *mutatis mutandis*, and the conclusions that they suggest, to the case of the Indian taxpayers.

THE CIVIL SERVICE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.

THE POSITION OF BRITISH INDIANS.

MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI AND THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSIONERS.

IMPORTANT CORRESPONDENCE.

The attention of our readers is directed to the following highly important correspondence with reference to the rights of British Indians in regard to the Civil Service of the United Kingdom. Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, whose vigilance on behalf of his fellow-countrymen is unceasing, has, it will be seen, succeeded in establishing conclusions of great significance and value.

Cambridge Lodge, West Hill Road, S.W.,
31st May, 1896.

Sir,—I shall feel much obliged by your giving me the following information.

The qualification for a candidate for the Examinations for the Civil Service of India is "(1) that he is a natural-born subject of her Majesty."

Similarly the qualification for a candidate for the Examinations for the Civil Services of the United Kingdom is: "(3), These examinations are open, under such general restrictions as may be laid down, to all natural-born subjects of her Majesty."

If so, am I right in considering that the Examinations for the Civil Services of the United Kingdom are fully open to Indians, just as much as to the British-born subjects?

Yours faithfully,
(Signed) DADABHAI NAOROJI.

J. S. Lockhart, Esq.,
Secretary and Reg., Civil Service Commission,
Cannon Row, Westminster, S.W.

In reply to the above letter, the Secretary to the Civil Service Commission forwarded to Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji a paper containing the regulations in respect of "Examinations held under the direction of the Civil Service Commissioners," at the same time directing Mr. Naoroji's attention to section 4 of the "General Notices" contained in that paper, as follows:—

4. NATIONALITY.—A person born in a foreign country who can prove that his father or his paternal grandfather was born in British Dominions, is, if he has not expatriated himself under the Naturalisation Act of 1870, admissible as a natural-born British subject to all open competitions which he is in other respects qualified to enter, except those for Student Interpreterships. For these he needs the permission of the Foreign Secretary. Naturalised aliens are admissible to compete for Home Civil Service appointments.

Thereupon the correspondence proceeded as follows:—

Cambridge Lodge, West Hill Road, S.W.,
5th June, 1896.

Dear Sir,—I am very much obliged to you for sending me a copy of the paper for the "Examinations held under the direction of the Civil Service Commissioners" and for directing my attention to section 4 about "Nationalities."

I hope you will kindly excuse me for troubling you again. I understand from the section that the Indians come under the definition of a "natural-born British subject," because British Dominions (in which the Candidate or his father, or his grandfather should have been born) include India. The reason I am obliged to ask this is, that in the Regulations for the Indian Civil Service the words used are "a natural-born subject" and in the paper you have been good enough to send me, the words are "a natural-born British subject."

I shall therefore be much obliged if you would kindly explain whether the difference in the words means any actual difference, or that these words mean the same thing as the definition in section 4 describes and that the Native of India is admissible as "a natural-born British subject"?

May I ask the favour of a copy of the Regulations for Examinations of the Engineer Students in the Navy?

Yours truly
(Signed) DADABHAI NAOROJI.

J. S. Lockhart Esq.,
Civil Service Commission,
Cannon Row, Westminster, S.W.

Civil Service Commission,
12th June, 1896.

Sir,—In reply to your letter of the 5th instant, I am directed by the Civil Service Commissioners to transmit the enclosed regulations and to state that natural-born subjects of Her Majesty are eligible in respect of nationality to compete for both the Home Civil Service and the Civil Service of India.

If you have any doubt as to your nationality you would probably do well to obtain a legal opinion on the subject.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
(Signed) J. S. LOCKHART.

D. Naoroji Esq.

Cambridge Lodge, West Hill Road, S.W.,
14th June, 1896.

Sir,—I thank you for your letter of the 12th inst. giving me the information I wanted.

In the paper you sent me before, I find that it begins with "General Notices" and in section 4 about "Nationality" I find the words admissible "to all open competitions." I shall feel further obliged if you would kindly inform me whether I am right in understanding that the "General Notices" apply to all the examinations held under the Civil Service Commissioners, including the military and navy.

I remain, your obedient servant,
(Signed) DADABHAI NAOROJI.

The Secretary,
Civil Service Commission, London, S.W.

Civil Service Commission,
19th June, 1896.

Sir,—With reference to your letter of the 14th inst., I am directed by the Civil Service Commissioners to state that the "General Notices" to which you refer may be regarded as applicable generally to all open competitive examinations held by this Board for situation in the Civil Service.

Examinations for commissions in the army are held under regulations issued by the War Office, and examinations for cadetships in the navy under regulations issued by the Admiralty.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
(Signed) JOHN HENNELL.

D. Naoroji, Esq.

Cambridge Lodge, West Hill Road, S.W.,
2nd August, 1896.

Sir,—Thanking you for your letter of 19th of June last, may I request the favour of some further explanation.

In your above letter you were good enough to inform me that:—

"The 'General Notices' to which you refer may be regarded as applicable generally to all open competitive examinations held by this Board for situation in the Civil Service,"

and further,

"Examinations for commissions in the army are held under regulations issued by the War Office, and examinations for cadetships in the navy under regulations issued by the Admiralty."

May I ask whether I am right in understanding that "all open competitive examinations" held by the Civil Service Commissioners for "situation in the Civil Service," include all examinations for all departments of the War Office and the Admiralty, *excepting* only the examinations for "commissions in the army" and for "cadetships in the navy"?

I remain, your obedient servant,
(Signed) DADABHAI NAOROJI.

The Secretary,
Civil Service Commission, London, S.W.

Civil Service Commission.
5th August, 1896.

Sir,—In reply to your letter of the 2nd instant, I am directed by the Civil Service Commissioners to state that whilst the great majority of the Clerkships in the Admiralty and War Office are filled by Open Competitive Examinations, the Tables mentioned at the head of the enclosed circular specify various other situations in both these departments which are filled by nomination. In cases where situations are filled by nomination, the functions of the Civil Service Commissioners are limited to examining the candidates officially nominated to them; they can give no information as to the persons from whom or the means by which nominations may be obtained.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
(Signed) J. S. Lockhart.

D. Naoroji, Esq.

Cambridge Lodge, West Hill Road,
Southfields, S.W.
26th August, 1896.

Sir,—I have received your letter of yesterday.

I have to request you to communicate to the Civil Service Commissioners my sincere thanks for so readily giving me all the information I asked from them in my correspondence.

I am, your obdt. servant,
(Signed) Dadabhai Naoroji.

The Secretary,
Civil Service Commission, London, S.W.

LORD WELBY'S COMMISSION.

MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI AND LORD WOLSELEY.

The statements and opinions put forward by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji on July 29th, when Lord Wolseley was giving evidence before the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, have been grossly and ludicrously misrepresented in certain quarters; we set out below, therefore, the full report of that day's proceedings so far as Mr. Naoroji had any share in them.

Mr. Naoroji first intervened when Lord Wolseley stated that "his idea with regard to the charges generally for the troops in India was that India should pay for everything connected with the army." "I say," Lord Wolseley declared, "supposing we had no British Empire and no British rule in India to be maintained, we should not have those batteries and these fortifications, and consequently, as we have India, and we have these batteries, India should pay for them." The report proceeds as follows:

13,188. Mr. Naoroji: But is it not for the sake of maintaining the British rule that all this British army and British fortifications and all these are there?—Lord Wolseley: No; it is for the purpose——

13,189. If British rule were not there you would not care a straw for India and would not go there?—Quite.

13,190. And you would not impose a British army upon India?—We do not impose a British army upon India; India asks for it.

13,191. You have a large European army imposed upon India for the purpose of maintaining British rule?—Why do you use the word "imposed"?

13,192. Because it is not with our consent; we have no voice; India has no voice?—That is a point I cannot go into.

The phrase "Indian requirements" being frequently employed, Mr. Naoroji again intervened:

13,243. Mr. Naoroji: When you use the phrase that "India requires" or "when India's emergency takes place" what do you mean? It is not India that requires these troops annually; properly speaking is it not Great Britain that requires these troops there to maintain her own rule there; otherwise India would not require any troops from you?—Lord Wolseley: I am afraid I cannot answer that question.

13,244. Mr. Naoroji: Is it not for British purposes?—Lord Wolseley: I hope you will excuse me and pardon me, but that is a subject I cannot go into.

13,245. Mr. Naoroji: It is rather unfair that repeatedly the expression is used "India's wants and India's requirements," and that these things are required in India's interests, when in reality it is all British interests, British wants, British purposes, in order to maintain British rule in India and nothing from England can ever be required.

Mr. Jackson: But surely that assumes that the British rule in India is of no value to India.

Mr. Naoroji: It is of value to India, but it is of value to Great Britain also.

Mr. Jackson: Then, if it is of value to India, it is for India's requirements, India's interests, India's wants.

Mr. Naoroji: It is for Britain also. Whatever is necessary for British rule should be supplied by Britain just as well as India. Is there not equal benefit, is there not benefit to both? This is all upon the supposition that it is all for the benefit of India, and Britain has simply nothing but a Quixotic and philanthropic purpose, for which it comes to India and saves India from Russian aggression.

13,246. Mr. Jackson: I do not understand the argument?—Lord Wolseley: I cannot follow the argument, but I would merely say that my views are that India never existed as India at all until we went there. She was merely an agglomeration of tiny little States, the Muhammadans cutting the throats of the Hindus, with constant and continual internal troubles. India has been constituted an empire by us; everything that India has got at the present moment that is worth having has been derived from English rule. That is the only commentary I have to make as regards what Mr. Naoroji has to say.

Mr. Naoroji: I had better say a few words afterwards.

Chairman: I think we must bear in mind that the English rule exists in India, and that it is not within the scope of our enquiry to go into the question of what would follow the removal of that rule or what would happen if that rule had never existed.

Mr. Naoroji: That question arises from the kind of remarks that are made; otherwise I confine myself to expenditure when I come to it.

Later, Lord Wolseley said: "I saw one Eurasian regiment, and I never saw a more wretched, useless, or miserable body of men in my life. I saw them during the Mutiny; they would not fight, they were always grumbling, they did nothing." The report continues:

13,384. Mr. Naoroji: Our object in this Commission is to ascertain what apportionment should be charged to each country in matters in which both are interested. You say England has done so much for India, but India must pay every farthing. Now let me read you a short statement?—Lord Wolseley: I cannot answer anything connected with the political condition of India. I am here to give you purely military opinions and answer purely military questions.

13,385. Sir Donald Stewart: May I ask one question about the army medical establishment. Have you got any views upon the subject of the amalgamation of the two branches of the branches of the army medical service, the Indian and the British?—Lord Wolseley: Yes, I think that would be a saving for India; I think it is a pity it is not done.

13,386. Chairman: Amalgamation of the two services?—To have only one medical service for India would be a saving to India and it would not hurt us, according to my notions.

13,387. Sir Donald Stewart: It would not disturb the efficiency?—According to my notion it would not.

13,388. Chairman: Mr. Naoroji, you heard what Lord Wolseley said. Of course it is for you to consider whether your questions go outside the line upon which you can expect him to give an answer.

Mr. Naoroji: I have to put questions within our Commission's reference, and I should have answers from Lord Wolseley just as he thinks proper; but my questions should be put, because the question has to be considered from the Indian point of view.

Chairman: I am speaking in consequence of what Lord Wolseley said to you. We must bear in mind that questions must come within the scope of our reference. You say their subject comes within that scope, but I think you have gone rather close upon the limits of our reference occasionally.

Mr. Naoroji: Yes; but there are several statements made by Lord Wolseley which require to be controverted, and especially one which I would take—Lord Wolseley urged very strongly that England made India. Now that is a point upon which there is another side of the picture also, and I must therefore have that side put in; and, besides, he said that India is not a whole nation; that is not a necessity. India is like Europe, you may say, a large continent, and there were several native powers instead of one native power. That does not answer in any way the question I want to put; I want to say—perhaps the question has been misunderstood and muddled up a good deal—that our object here in the Commission is to ascertain what apportionment should be charged to each country for purposes in which both are interested. I want therefore to bring out those purposes in which both England and India are interested, and what England ought to contribute towards the apportionment as well as India. I am not saying that the whole benefit is British. I grant that whatever is done in the whole administration, India has its benefit; but England also has its benefit and therefore what portion should England pay for all that administration; and that is what I have to bring out, because that is the principal question for which the Commission is formed.

13,388. Chairman: Just bear in mind what the scope of our Commission is, and also bear in mind what Lord Wolseley's position is.—If I might say so, those all are questions of relative advantages, but upon those I cannot be expected to give evidence; I can only give you evidence upon facts.

13,389. Mr. Caine: Lord Wolseley is an expert witness upon specific points?—On facts.

Mr. Caine: He really ought only to be examined upon matters upon which he himself is an expert witness.

13,390. Chairman: Quite so.—And upon facts. I am not prepared to enter into problematical questions as to what would be the future.

Mr. Naoroji: I am not putting problematical questions. I wish to give facts as they exist, and I want to ascertain them from Lord Wolseley, if he says he cannot answer those questions——

Mr. Jackson: May we not have this question?

Chairman: Time gets on; please put your question.

13,391. Mr. Naoroji: Lord Wolseley, you may have read an extract from Lord Kimberley's speech that I gave at the time of the examination of Sir Ralph Knox?—Yes; but may I say I read all those, and I cannot answer them. I read all the questions that you put to Sir Ralph Knox, and I am not prepared to answer any of them.

13,392. Very well, then. Of course, if you are not prepared and will not answer——?—It is not a question of "will not."

Mr. Jackson: I do not think it ought to be put—here we are in the presence of reporters—that Lord Wolseley "will not" answer the question. I do not think that responsibility ought to be put upon Lord Wolseley.

13,393. Mr. Naoroji: Having had a definite answer, I am not going to put those questions now. I only put a question which arises from Lord Wolseley's assumption as to what England has done for India. He bases all his argument upon the assertion that England has done so much for India that India must pay every farthing.

Mr. Jackson: Will you not put the question?

Lord Wolseley: That is a historical question. I am not prepared to enter into that. These are all historical. I am quite prepared to answer you any questions that you will ask me bearing on the establishment of the army or the efficiency of the army, either in England or in India, or anything that comes within the scope of my own duties, but nothing else.

13,394. Mr. Naoroji: Then it is very unfortunate that you made the remark several times that India was made by England what it was, and therefore India must pay every farthing for whatever England has to spend or whatever England imposes upon it, and you even demur to the word "imposing." Well, therefore, unfortunately these remarks being made I was bound to ask questions?—I am much obliged to you for your commentary on my evidence.

13,395. Mr. Naoroji: Of course, if I am not to put this question or to go into this matter I, of course, yield to the decision of the Chairman. I only wanted to ask these questions because these remarks were made.

Mr. Caine: We ought to discriminate a little in the questions. I do not attach any importance to what Lord Wolseley says on historical questions, but I attach the highest importance to what he says on military questions, and, when we come to report, I do not suppose that we shall be influenced in the drafting of our report by any opinion that Lord Wolseley gives either on political questions or on historical questions?—They will be of no value.

13,396. We only deal with what he says on military questions?—These are the only remarks of value in this enquiry.

Chairman: I think we ought to go farther than that. I do not think that questions simply involving policy ought to be put to a witness like Lord Wolseley, because it is rather hard upon a witness to have to reply, "I shall not," or "I cannot answer that question." I think the questions ought not to be put to him.

Mr. Naoroji: I demur to the statement that I have said one single word to him upon a question of policy. I ask to put questions to Lord Wolseley, and he can make any answer to them he chooses.

Mr. Jackson: We have not heard the question. Let us hear it put.

Chairman: Perhaps you will put your question; we quite understand what the position is.

13,397. Mr. Naoroji: Very well; with regard to what England has done for India for her benefit or for her injury, I will just read a short statement?—Might I beg you to ask me a question? I shall be very glad to answer it. I do not want an essay read to me about what has taken place at some previous period of history. If you will ask me a question I will do my best to answer it, but to hear you read out some essay upon some problem would be of no use to me, and I am afraid I could give you no valuable reply to it.

13,398. If I ask my question I must explain what I mean. I will put the question at once. You state that England made India. I say that India has made England the most powerful, the richest, and the greatest country in the world, while the British administration, under the British authorities not by the British people——

Mr. Jackson: I think that should be given as evidence; that is not a question, is it?

Mr. Naoroji: I want to ask this question; what England has done for India? I want to point out that England has done the greatest possible material injury to India. I ask the question, is it so, or not?

Chairman: Is not that a matter for you to give in evidence?

Mr. Naoroji: Yes, I will give evidence.

Chairman: That is, expressing your own views. We should be glad to hear them.

Mr. Naoroji: Yes.

Chairman: But would it not be better to hear that from you, if you went into the witness chair?

Mr. Naoroji: Certainly, but when any witness makes a statement which ought to be controverted at once, I am obliged to intervene; otherwise, if I did not intervene, it may be taken to be my view. However, if my view is to be taken from my own evidence I am satisfied.

Chairman: If you will come in and give us evidence upon these points we shall be very glad, because it really is expressing your own view.

Mr. Naoroji: I am asking whether Lord Wolseley's view is the same or not.

Mr. Caine: Lord Wolseley on the subject you refer to only expresses a generally accepted opinion to which you demur and to which I demur too.

Mr. Naoroji: It is a wrongly accepted opinion altogether, and therefore it should not go without being contradicted.

Chairman: Quite so. I know, Mr. Naoroji, your views upon this point, and I think it may be very desirable that you should have the opportunity of expressing them to us, but I think they would be expressed better in evidence than in questions to witnesses, which the witnesses cannot answer.

Mr. Naoroji: I do not want to put any questions that the witness cannot answer, but I am quite willing to give it up.

Chairman: If you wish to give us evidence.

Mr. Naoroji: That I have already offered. I think it is a fair way to put it.

A BUDGET DEBATE IN BOMBAY.

NOTABLE SPEECH BY LORD SANDHURST.

CONGRATULATIONS TO NON-OFFICIAL MEMBERS.

WHY NOT MAKE THE DISCUSSION FRUITFUL?

On more than one occasion we have had the pleasure of acknowledging the new and better spirit which Lord Sandhurst has introduced into the Government of Bombay. His speech in the Bombay Legislative Council at the close of the recent discussion (August 17th and 18th) of the Bombay Provincial Budget has given so much satisfaction in India that we may well record it here in full. Some remarks upon it, from the pen of an esteemed correspondent in Bombay, will be found in "Indiana." The question that Lord Sandhurst's speech suggests is, why should not discussion upon the Budget be rendered fruitful? At present no division, and no amendment, is permitted. The criticisms of the non-official members, to the value of which Lord Sandhurst pays a striking tribute, are under the present system robbed of effect. Lord Sandhurst said:—

It now becomes my business to say a few words to wind up the proceedings of this Council on the annual discussion which takes place upon the Budget. Last year I inherited the Budget from my predecessor, Lord Harris, and could claim no responsibility for it at all. To-day, however, I share with my two honourable colleagues the responsibility for the statement and figures put before the meeting. It is very satisfactory to me that Government do not find themselves in such straits as they anticipated. There is one circumstance in connection with this day's proceedings to which I should like to draw attention, as it is of a personal nature. More or less, half-a-century ago on this very day a stranger was ushered into the world, and nobody could tell what a distinguished career lay in his future. That stranger was my honourable colleague on my left (Mr. Nugent), and I tender him my earnest congratulations and good wishes on his birthday to-day. (Hear, hear.) I should now like to say a word or two respecting this meeting. Mr. Birdwood made a remark or two thereon, and although I was not here just when Mr. Nugent commenced his speech, I suppose that he also said something on the subject.

"The one Opportunity in the Year."

I have now had something like twenty years' experience of the House of Lords, and may therefore express an opinion, and I venture to say it would be impossible to find any Legislative Chamber in which the Budget proceedings could have been conducted with more decorum than those of the Council over which I preside or where more carefully prepared speeches could be heard, speeches better both in style and tone than those we have heard to-day and yesterday. Some of the speeches were long, but of that I do not at all complain. This is the one opportunity in the year when hon. members can put forward their views in this Chamber in regard to the financial and general administration of Government. It is certainly to be expected that if these views are to be expressed at all a considerable time must be occupied in setting them forth. Not only have the speeches been good: they have also been impartial, to the purpose, and free from personalities. I will say this, that instead of the Budget discussion being looked upon by members of Government as a tedious burden, taking up a vast amount of the time of those engaged in administering the affairs of the Presidency, I shall look back upon these two days' proceedings with considerable pleasure, though unfortunately we have chosen for this discussion the first fine day we have had in Poona for the last five weeks, and have had to spend the whole of the day in this chamber. But business must come first and pleasure afterwards.

"Suggestions worthy of Consideration."

Mr. Tilak suggested, I think, although I could not make quite sure of his meaning, some course of arrangement by which our proceedings might become livelier, and he reiterated the statement two or three times. I have had considerable experience of public meetings of different sorts, and I am bound to say that though vigorous speeches and great liveliness are more amusing than a dull and matter-of-fact discussion of figures, which do not lend themselves to elaborate jokes, yet if these proceedings had become what I understand too lively, and if there were two parties of pronounced and opposite views, I should be inclined to vacate the chair and follow Mr. Pickwick's advice, if my principles allowed it, to shout with the largest crowd. (Laughter.) However, there was no occasion for anything of that kind. To-day and yesterday I had the assistance of the every member of Council in keeping order at our deliberations. It would be impossible to go into the details of all the criticisms that have been made; many answers have been given in speeches of considerable length by my colleagues, and especially by the financial member. I shall, of course, have an opportunity of reviewing the speeches made when we get them in their corrected form. Several suggestions have struck me as worthy of consideration, and when I read those speeches I shall make it a point to consider suggestions and, if need be, obtain information on the various points raised by hon. members. I wish to make one or two remarks in regard to the educational Budget. Since many of my recreative hours are passed in giving away prizes some people may think that education is one of my fads.

Education.

And I am indeed glad to say we are able to spend increasing funds on that important branch of the administration. It is encouraging to me to look at the figures which I have got out. I give the average expenditure. In the five years from April 1st, 1885, to April 1st, 1890, the actuals were fourteen lakhs and ninety thousand rupees, and in the next period of five years, sixteen and a-half lakhs. It is true that these are the actuals, and that possibly in the Budget larger grants were made. In the revised figures for the year 1895-6 the grant is put down at eighteen lakhs, while the figures for this year's Budget come to twenty lakhs. I should like to refer to one point touched on in the speech of Mr. Setalvad, who seemed to assume that, while we had too few trained masters for primary schools there were no trained masters at all for secondary and high schools. The training of masters for middle and high schools is a matter that has engaged the attention of Government. I understand the Hon. Mr. Setalvad to say they received no training as teachers. It is true they do not go to a training college, but in other ways they do receive a sound training. Some, as Dakshina Fellows, have spent a considerable time in teaching under the supervision of the staff of the colleges. The high school masters go through the four years course at a high school and then through the four years course at one of the colleges. During the whole of this eight years they have practical acquaintance with the methods of the best teachers we have. Afterwards they come as assistants under the influence of head masters, whose reputation depends more on the assistant masters they turn out than on their teaching in class. Masters of middle schools have as pupils both the middle school course and the high school course. We consider that no normal school for middle and high school teachers is needed. We agree with the Director of Public Instruction that in reality the University is a normal school for masters in the high school; and the high schools in their turn are normal schools for teachers in middle schools. Mr. Tilak made reference to what he termed channels of expenditure, and I understood him to say that these channels of expenditure should be changed. I think, possibly, he does not quite see that it would be practicable to adopt his suggestion, remembering that the greater part of the expenditure is made up for fixed charge. So that the money at the absolute discretion of Government is comparatively small. Hence no changes on a considerable scale could take place without great dislocation, if not total disorganisation, of the administration. There is one point I wish to refer to which was brought out in the speech of the Hon. Mr. Dharamsi, whom we congratulate upon taking part in this Budget discussion; and I am sure my honourable colleagues will join with me also in congratulating him upon the attractive way in which he put his views before us. He called the attention of Government to the disadvantages his co-religionists are under in regard to higher

education. I am bound to say that during my visit to Sind I was struck with the fact that in one school of 500 boys only 3 per cent. of the scholars were Muhammadans. I quite sympathise with what has fallen from Mr. Dharamsey, but I think he will agree with me that there are considerable difficulties in the way of favouring one sect more than another. I don't know that I can give him any more satisfactory answer than that, but I would point out that by what he has done his Highness the Nizam of Hyderabad has set an example of private benefaction. I also know that Mr. Kazi Shahabudin has set apart a considerable sum—Rs. 60,000 I believe—the interest of which is to provide scholarships for Muhammadan boys. Mr. Khare said that the tuition in small schools in the mofussil was conducted in such a way that the teaching was dull, the pupils listless, and so on. I am sorry to say that at present I have not had much opportunity of visiting and inspecting mofussil schools, and so cannot state my opinion on this subject. But I think that this subject, like several others of a kindred nature referred to here, can best be dealt with at the Educational Conference that we propose should take place.

Bombay Municipal Corporation.

The last point to which I wish to refer is in regard to the remarks of my honourable colleague, Mr. Mehta, upon the recent letter of the Government of Bombay as to the grant it is proposed to hand over to the Municipality for building purposes on certain terms. Mr. Mehta yesterday explained his interpretation of the law of the case, but Government, also, are not without their legal advisers. I do not in the least intend to follow all the arguments advanced by the two great controversialists who spoke one yesterday and the other this afternoon. I do not propose to follow either gentlemen into the past history of the case. What I am most anxious to do, and what my two colleagues are most anxious to do, is to look to the future, to see if we can bring about a different state of affairs. (Hear, hear.) I shall not proceed to criticise the methods or the conduct of the Municipal Corporation, either in the present or in the immediate past. If the conduct of the members of the Municipality has been unsatisfactory there are those who can call them to account. We all admired, I for one, the enthusiasm with which Mr. Mehta espoused the cause of the Corporation, where he undoubtedly wields a very great and leading influence, and I shall not readily forget the forensic skill with which he put forward his side of the case. But if I may diverge for one moment I would refer to the discussion in the public press and on the platform lately as to the relative merits and methods of the old and new diplomacy. I am not sure whether my honourable friend, Mr. Mehta, did not start yesterday the newest diplomacy. It seemed to me that while this question is the subject of negotiation, and the statement of the case for the Corporation is on its way to Government, it was somewhat surprising that he should deliver an ultimatum as to what the Corporation would or would not do under certain circumstances.

Mr. Mehta here rose and said: I am free to confess, your Excellency, that in the excitement of debate I was carried away too far, and said more than I had intended or was justified in saying. (Hear, hear.)

H.E. the President: The members of the Council will agree with me that that is a generous admission. (Cheers.) I will myself speak for the Corporation on this occasion, and will say that the admission will not cause Mr. Mehta to lose weight in the Corporation, but will increase the admiration of its members for Mr. Mehta's public spirit and fairness. (Hear, hear.) I was glad to hear the admission, because once you have burnt your ships you must go forward: you have no retreat, and cannot retrieve a blunder. It is difficult for a man who has made a determined statement as to what he will or will not do to retract; while on the other hand it is difficult for the opposite party to make further concessions, when a definite declaration has been made. Therefore, I welcome most cordially the admission of my honourable colleague that he had said something in heat of debate which he is at liberty to withdraw or modify. I do not think myself it is advisable for us more than we can help to dwell on the history of the past in regard to the Bombay schools. The thing is to look at the future and make the best arrangements that we can.

"Patience—the most useful quality for a Governor."

When I came out here I was given much good advice, some by wise men and some by others of whose judgment I have not so high an opinion, as to what I should observe and the lines of policy I should pursue. But the experience of nearly a year and a-half that I have had has led me to this conclusion, that perhaps the most useful quality for a Governor is the quality of patience. In regard to this particular matter, I shall exercise that quality, and I am sure both my colleagues will exercise it also. We will do our best to bring the matter to a happy and satisfactory conclusion. I feel very often that I am in need not so much of the support as the restraint of my two honourable colleagues. What with my residence in Bombay, my acquaintance with the schools there, and also the hurried visit to the poorer parts of Bombay and to the slums (of which, I think, I have more knowledge than a great many residents of Bombay), I am in fear of being too much of a Bombay man. But I cannot help reflecting that while Bombay lies nearer to my affections there are other parts of the Presidency to be considered. I have now visited the greater part of the Presidency, and I have had an opportunity of seeing and conversing with leaders of public opinion in the Presidency proper and in Sind. I must be very careful, in spite of the affection I have for the capital, to be fair all round. Some mention was made by Mr. Mehta of the grant towards the building of Bhooleshwur School, and Mr. Kirkham gave a hint that the grant has not yet been paid. But I need not point out that though the bargain was made by a previous Government it will be carried out by mine. In regard to the matter of higher education, I have said on many platforms that while I am anxious to foster primary education I am in no way blind to the requirements of higher education. Whatever opponents may think as to our policy with regard to the University (and the intentions of administrators are often liable to misinterpretations and misrepresentations) what we want is to do the best we can for all classes in this Presidency. I shall endeavour with the help of my colleagues, and such suggestions as I from time to time receive, to do the best I can for the whole of the Presidency, whose interests I have the honour temporarily to hold in trust.

PRINCE RANJITSINHJI.

We take the following extracts from an "interview" with Prince Ranjitsinhji which appears in the September No. of the *Strand Magazine*:—

"I was born in India on September 10, 1872, at Sarodar, in the province of Kathiawar. I was always very fond of athletics, and, I should say, commenced playing cricket when I was about ten or eleven years of age."

"And when you came to England?"

"I was about sixteen when I first arrived in this country. No, I did not proceed to Cambridge at once. I remained in London for about six months under the care of a private tutor, preparing for my exams. During that time I played a great deal of lawn tennis, a game I am very fond of, and a little cricket with a private club. When I went to Cambridge, however, I was very keen upon the game, and practised assiduously. Naturally, I found a great difference in the Indian and English styles, and I had, if I may say so, to 'unlearn' the former before I could do much with the latter. I found English cricket very different from what I had been accustomed to, although I had the advantage of being coached by some of the Surrey professionals, such as Sharpe, Richardson, Lockwood, Watts, and others. They come down to Cambridge every year, I may explain, to coach the undergraduates. Did I not find the new game hard to learn? Yes, I did; for it was almost two years before I was capable of doing much with it. I should say that I was not able to play it properly until 1891. Of course, I did not go

into the University eleven until 1893. That was, in fact, my first and last year, as I came down at the end of the season."

"County cricket? Oh, I think that is very good indeed, as a rule; although there is a proviso to be added. That is, that I consider it is beginning to be looked upon in a too serious manner, and is being made too much of a business character."

"The counties? On their season's all-round form, I think that Surrey is the best team. Here, also, I might add, upon a good wicket. Yorkshire, on the other hand, are the best team upon a bad wicket. Another thing is, that I consider that if Richardson were taken out of the Surrey team they would drop back considerably. Richardson is a grand bowler, and in his absence the county eleven would suffer an almost irretrievable loss. Of course, the same may be said of others beyond Surrey. For instance, if you were to take Mold out of the Lancashire team, the result would be the same. No, I do not think Yorkshire would be affected in the same manner if any one particular bowler were withdrawn. They have a first-class reserve to fall back upon, and are in fact a fine all-round batting, bowling, and fielding side."

Australian cricket was then touched upon by the Prince.

"The Antipodean eleven playing in England are a very good side," he remarked. "They are very good all round, but their batting, as a whole, is superior to their bowling."

"Still, they have been very successful in their engagements, haven't they?"

"Yes. I should say they are a better team than any other I have seen with one exception, in the bowling of the 1886 eleven. At that time C. T. B. Turner and Ferris were at their best."

"Let me see, I think G. H. S. Trott coached you a little when you first came to England?" I remarked.

"No," was the smiling reply, "there's not an atom of truth in that report. Yes, I see it has been stated as a fact in certain quarters, but you may deny it *in toto*. What really happened was this: When I came across from India I visited the Oval in company with my tutor. The match then being played was Surrey *v.* the Australians. We were invited into the pavilion, and Mr. Alcock very kindly introduced several members of the Colonial eleven to me. Percy M'Donnell, C. T. B. Turner, and G. H. S. Trott were amongst the number. They chatted to me upon cricket matters for a few moments, but I received no hints whatever. How the idea first gained ground I am unable to say; but it is utter nonsense to imagine for a moment that I was then assisted in any way by Trott."

"What style of batting should I recommend? I should advise any young player to follow up the style, under capable coaching, that comes to him naturally. I cannot say that I am an advocate for stone-walling, but every player finds it necessary to exhibit a certain degree of caution at times. There is no reason why a batsman, however, should try to score at the expense of getting out, and simply to earn the applause of a certain section of the public. The showy player may be cheered by those who simply visit a match for the express purpose of witnessing rapid scoring, and who do not care or know anything about the more delicate side of the game. I certainly do not believe in 'playing for the gallery,' neither do I believe in making the game unnecessarily slow. A player should endeavour to strike the happy medium. The method of the county championship? I think it was a right and generous recognition of merit when the new counties were included in the running, and it has made the struggle keener. Oh, yes, I have heard that several advocate some of the older counties being dropped but I do not favour such a suggestion."

A recollection of seeing the Prince in football costume while at Cambridge next provoked a question from me upon the subject.

"Yes," he replied, "I played football at Cambridge until I hurt my knee, then I thought it time to give it up. Association at first, and Rugby afterwards, as I cared for it much more than the dribbling game; my knee gave way, however, at Association."

"Which do I consider the best game? Rugby, certainly. It is possible to get up your interest in even a bad game under that code; but under the other, the play must be very good indeed to repay watching it. Another thing is, I consider Rugby far safer from a player's point of view. You may get a scratch or a bruise, but in Association, if you are kicked or thrown, the injury is of a far more lasting character."

"Do I go in for athletics? Not much now, but I am very fond of shooting. Cycling? Yes, I cycle a little, and I have two American bicycles in the pavilion now. I am very fond of tennis and racquets. In fact, at one time, I played the former very much better than I did cricket. Yes (in reply to an incredulous smile on my part), I assure you it is a fact."

"And I believe you bowl a little?" I remarked as I rose to leave the Prince.

"Yes, I can bowl a little. In fact, I was very successful when I first commenced playing for Sussex. Now, however, Mr. Murdoch does not care to put me on, as he is afraid I should spoil my batting. Mr. Stoddart, of Middlesex, is not put on to bowl, I believe from the same cause, so we sympathise with each other for the harsh treatment of our respective captains. My style? I should describe as being a slow medium, with a break from the off."

Then, as a final question, I asked the Prince if he could tell me how he had been so successful at such an early period of his career.

"Luck," was his laughing response. "I commence my practice very early. I am shooting through the winter, and so keep myself fit, and in April I am at the nets. But luck is everything with a cricketer. If he has that—and a little skill—he has little to fear."

Commenting on Lord G. Hamilton's remarks, in his recent Budget speech, upon the native press of India, the *Times of India* (September 4th) writes: "these remarks might with advantage have been less brief, inasmuch as they seem to make an unjustifiably sweeping charge against the native press as a whole. . . . . We are glad to feel that there are many, very many, honourable exceptions to this indictment, and that the majority of the native journals of this country are conducted with conspicuous fairness and impartiality."

"THE SYSTEMATIC PLUNDER OF INDIA."

[From "The Investors' Review."]

In all probability the true reason for the persistence of the Government in charging the ordinary pay and the ordinary cost of transport for these troops (the Indian troops at Suakin) on the Indian revenue, is that the War Office here ordered it to do so. The actual amount involved is small, not so small as the Government made out, for the £35,000 mentioned will only pay the troops for seven months, and we think it not improbable that much larger numbers of men than are there at present will be required to assist in the Soudan war for indefinite months to come. So, if we put the charge at £100,000 per annum, all told, it will be well within the mark in all probability. But at the largest estimate it is a paltry affair and mean to a degree. The policy of the English War Office, however, has consistently been, ever since we took over India from the Company in 1858, to load upon the backs of the Indian people as many excessive charges as possible. The ordinary expenditure of India in England, in payment of English soldiers trained and sent to India and for war materials furnished through the British War Office, is a permanent scandal of the grossest description, and, by all the laws governing the rise and fall of empires, must contribute one day in an important degree to the destruction of our Indian dominion. For the War Office, then, to have consented to the payment by the English Treasury of Indian troops employed in the Egyptian war, would have been the surrender by it of a part of the power to systematically rob that dependency. So the Government had no alternative any more than other Governments, Liberal or Tory, which have gone before it. Parliamentary figureheads exist principally to obey, or to screen, the permanent bureaucracy and the miserable spectacle presented by Lord George Hamilton in the House of Commons on 6th July last was all in the way of earning his salary.

The episode fills the mind with disgust. It cannot really be maintained that honest conviction was strongly manifested on either side of the House, except by Mr. John Morley. His speech had a genuine ring of intense earnestness throughout; yet even he, were he Secretary of State for India tomorrow, would most likely have had to do very much what Lord George Hamilton has done—yield or go. We wish it could be believed that the consequences of this display of base selfishness in a small thing, on the part of the English officials and their parliamentary mouthpieces, might be such as to prevent a recurrence of impositions upon India of a similar kind, but that is too much to expect. The rumpus caused by this small matter measured by £ s. d., and the ill-feeling it has produced in India, will pass away and be forgotten. Its main use may be said to be to divert the attention of both peoples from the systematic plunder of India which goes on all the year round unheeded. It is often so in politics; great crimes against a nation may be committed with impunity, when a small incident, in itself of no vital importance, will cause a *furore* of excitement. In the present case there is a danger involved, of course, which magnifies the incident—a danger that might, as Lord Salisbury in former times was shrewd enough to see, involve most serious consequences to the people of England. Should we fall into the habit of employing mercenary troops from India in the various African wars, which we seem destined to wage for another generation—assuming that India keeps financially on her legs for so long—a day might come when an unscrupulous Government would not hesitate to employ them against ourselves. But this point was comparatively little insisted upon in the recent debate, except by Mr. Morley—most of the energy of speakers, as well as press, was spent in denouncing the meanness of the one particular act. It was mean; but the danger behind it lay not so much in its meanness, as in the readiness, which will grow with use, to draw upon India for the men and money to conduct military expeditions in other parts of the Empire. And, after all, this is in accordance with the arrogant spirit of the modern Imperialist, whose endeavour it is to run the Empire in order to make money by it.

THE CRIMINAL LAW OF INDIA.

Under this heading Mr. E. H. Pickersgill, M.P., contributed to the *Pall Mall Gazette* of September 26th an interesting review of Mr. J. D. Mayne's edition (recently noticed in our columns) of the Indian Penal Code. We take the following extracts from Mr. Pickersgill's article:—

The Indian Penal Code is beyond question one of the most interesting "documents" of criminal jurisprudence. In form, a unique interest attaches to it as the first, and so far the only, example in legislation of the method of stating the law in general propositions accompanied by specific illustrations, thus combining the good points of statute-law and case-law. This method, invented by Macaulay, and described by Sir Frederick Pollock as "an instrument of new constructive power," has been triumphantly justified by thirty-six years' practical experience of its working in India. Passing from the form to the substance of the Code, we enter on a wide field of controversy. It is obvious that the criminal law which is embodied in the Indian Penal Code is not a local growth, but is based on notions evolved in totally different circumstances by a different race of people. Moreover, while it is clear that the Code does not represent Indian ideas, it is equally true that in certain respects it does not represent *our* ideas of practical legislation. We have in fact laid upon India a yoke which we ourselves would be unable to bear. Apart altogether from the enactments which are justified by local circumstances, there are many provisions in the Indian Penal Code which, in 1860 at all events, we should never have dreamed of enacting for ourselves, and there are some which we should not dream of enacting now. By way of example, take the law as to "cheating," contained in section 415 of the Code, by which it is enacted that, "whoever, by deceiving any person, fraudulently or dishonestly induces the person so deceived

to deliver any property," and so on, commits a crime. Here it will be observed that the words are of the widest possible character; they cover the case of a promise as to future conduct not intended to be kept, and under them any person who failed to fulfil a civil contract would be liable to be harassed by a criminal prosecution. The provision goes far beyond the law, not only of England, but also of France. And thus arises the anomaly that we are enforcing by a criminal sanction upon an Eastern people a standard of commercial morality which would be regarded as intolerable in London or Paris. As another illustration I may cite the law as to negligence in the use of machinery. Section 287 of the Penal Code makes it a crime punishable with six months' imprisonment for any person "knowingly or negligently to omit to take such order with any machinery in his possession or under his care as is sufficient to guard against any probable danger to human life from such machinery." This provision again goes very far beyond anything in our English Factory Acts. Yet another example is furnished by the criminal law of defamation, respecting which it may suffice to quote the comment of Mr. Whitley Stokes, that the provisions "would if strictly applied to English and (probably) native scandalmongers lead to alarming consequences." In two other cases England long lagged behind India. The procuring of girls for immoral purposes had been a crime in India for a quarter of a century before a similar protection was extended to girls in England. Lastly, the Indian Penal Code passed in 1860 protected children of tender years against cruelty and acts endangering life or health on the part of their parents or guardians; whereas we in England had to wait until 1889 for our first Act for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children.

The Code of Criminal Procedure is open to much the same kind of criticism as the Penal Code itself; that is, it represents English, not Indian ideas, and as representing English ideas the whole system is based on "public sympathy with equity and the desire to have justice done"; whereas, according to the official statement, "public opinion in India is an apathetic, if not an adverse, influence in the investigation of local crime." Even the elaborate scheme of appeals, which plays so large a part in the administration of the criminal law in India, has its seamy side. For we are told that "it is a too common fault of the native magistrates who preside over the lower courts to pass a decision with the fear of reversal before their eyes, and to acquit accordingly in all but the very simplest or plainest cases." As in 1892 there were 32,429 sentences reversed or reduced on appeal, this result is not perhaps surprising. But the effect of all this on the native mind is disastrous. The official report states that "among the people at large who have had experience of the working of the criminal law the impression prevails that the provisions unduly favour the chance of escape of a person who is really guilty." It would be peculiarly unfortunate in India, where the great difficulty in administering the criminal law has always been to secure the co-operation of the people in putting down high-handed crime, if the opinion were to spread that a just charge will probably result in an acquittal.

Review.

ANCIENT INDIA.

Ancient India. Its Invasion by Alexander the Great. By J. W. M'CRINDLE, M.A., M.R.A.S., F.R.S.G.S. New edition. (London: Constable and Co.)

Of the series of works on Ancient India, translated by Mr. M'Crindle from ancient authors, this is undoubtedly the one most likely to attract the attention of the general reader. The students of ancient geography are necessarily few. The subject is one which only commends itself to the specialist. But there must be many readers outside the ranks of the specialists to whom ancient history, and more especially the history of so imposing a personality as Alexander's, commends itself, and who would gladly seize the opportunity of going to the fountain-head for their information if such an opportunity were afforded them. Of late years the English nation has come to feel with ever-increasing intensity that the keystone and centre of the Empire is India, and the interest aroused by this feeling has extended to the early period of Indian history. The long series of works published by the Clarendon Press and Messrs. Constable and Co. in particular, bear evidence to the reality of the demand for information. The fact that Mr. M'Crindle's work has reached a second edition is in itself a striking proof of the attention which is being paid to Indian annals. For this is in no real sense a history of Alexander's invasion of India. Rather it is a collection of the materials available for such a history, with some notes, and suggestions, and the discussion of a few disputed points in topography. Moreover there is much suggestiveness in the long preface to the second edition where it is shown that, apart from the mere commercial demand for a second edition, some revision or defence of the author's opinions was necessitated by the publication of a work by Franz Schwarz, of Munich, directly bearing on the campaigns of Alexander in the East, of Major General Haig's volume on the Indus Delta, and of a lecture by Colonel Holdich on Alexander's retreat from India.

"IMPERFECT DISINFECTION IS NO DISINFECTION AT ALL."

The Only Reliable Disinfecting Powder IS "CALVERT'S,"

Guaranteed to contain 15 per cent. CALVERT'S No. 5 Carbolic, the strongest disinfectant known.

In 6d., 1/-, and 1/6 Tins; also 7lb. and 14lb. Cases, at 2/6 and 4/- each (English Rates).

Cheaper in use than Powders at lower rates, much less being needed. Will not clog pipes or drains.

☞ AVOID WORTHLESS IMITATIONS MADE WITH TAR OILS.

Dr. R. M. Gover, in Report to Director-General of Convict Prisons, says "The preparations of Carbolic Acid supplied by Messrs. Calvert and Co. are, in my opinion, *much superior to those of any other manufacturer.*"

F. C. CALVERT AND CO., MANCHESTER.

There are many reasons to account for the somewhat scanty treatment hitherto meted out to Alexander's Indian campaign. In the first place, it has always been in connection with the history of Greece, or of Hellenic civilisation, that Alexander's conquests have been discussed, and it is only of late years that the awakening of an interest other than the mere scholarly and antiquarian interest in Eastern affairs has assigned to this portion of the great conqueror's achievements its proper importance. Also, the comparative permanence, slight though it was, of Alexander's arrangements in Asia Minor led to the gradual overthrow of Persian influence, and by opening up the way for Hellenic civilisation rendered possible also the extension of Christianity to those regions. But the wave of conquest that passed over the Hindu Kush receded again leaving little or no trace of its passage, and India remained isolated from the Western world, developing its religion, arts, and civilisation on its own lines. Now, however, that the point of view is transferred from Pella or Athens to Attock and Peshawar, the records of the Macedonian inroad acquire a fresh value as a picture of Indian civilisation nineteen centuries ago. Brief though the glimpse is, its worth is considerably enhanced by reflection on the centuries that elapse before the Western world is again permitted to look upon the Eastern. To the modern student of the North-West frontier question, Alexander's military movements are of special significance as illustrating the difficulty of the only really practicable military route into India, namely, the route by the Khaiber Pass. That a picked force of veteran troops under the leadership of, perhaps, the greatest general that ever lived, without the encumbrances of a modern army, should have successfully accomplished the difficult passage, and then have defeated Porus and his large forces on the Djhilam, is less an argument against the wisdom of Porus's position than a proof of Alexander's surpassing ability. Porus had the satisfaction of knowing that he had offered Alexander the most serious resistance he had hitherto encountered in the East. To argue that the proper place to check an advancing enemy is the Hindu Kush would be equivalent to maintaining that, because Hannibal and Napoleon both invaded Italy from the north, therefore the true frontier of Italy is the western foot of the Alps.

Mr. M'Crindle, although he has prefixed to his work, by way of introduction, a life of Alexander, which if a little unnecessary is as at any rate convenient, has entered into no discussion of his character, though his omission or qualified admission of some of the less creditable anecdotes told in connection with Alexander seem to indicate his preference for the moderate views of Freeman and Thirlwall. He has limited his task to the translation of such portions of the works of Arrian, Quintus Curtius, Diodorus Siculus, Plutarch, and Justin, as bear on the short period legitimately embraced by the title of his volume. Occasionally he departs from his scheme of providing materials for history, as in his appreciation of the comparative values of the authors whom he presents in English dress, and in some few of his appendices, which are not unfrequently prolix or beside the mark. We might refer for instances to the notes on peacocks, on serpents, or on the bore of the Hughli. The translations are literal but readable, and the indexes fairly complete. There are still some clerical errors which the revision proper to a second issue should have removed, as, for instance, the spelling of Sousa on the map. The maps themselves are convenient guides to the route of Alexander's forces but are not sufficiently complete to enable the reader to follow the details of the campaigns without the aid of Kiepert. Comparatively few additions would make them adequate for this purpose also and greatly increase the reader's comfort. Printing, paper, and binding reflect great credit on Messrs. Constable and Co.

The multiplicity of subjects dealt with in "Pros and Cons: A Guide to the Controversies of the Day" (Swan Sonnenschein and Co.), prohibits anything more than a brief statement, in each case, of some of the arguments "for" and "against." Questions political, social, and theological are discussed with brevity and impartiality, and a large number of general readers will probably find the compilation useful. It is perhaps a pity that no more than four pages out of some three hundred are given to Indian questions. "Child Marriages," "Indian Home Rule," and "Indian Defence" are summarily disposed of. But there is more in the Indian problem than that.

BIBLIOGRAPHY of ARTICLES in MONTHLY and QUARTERLY MAGAZINES on INDIAN SUBJECTS.

SEPTEMBER, 1896.

Geographical Journal. Curzon, Hon. G. N., "Pamirs."

Indian Magazine and Review (A. Constable and Co., 2, Whitehall Gardens, S.W.). R. H., "Travancore." Olcott, Col. H. S., "A Rajput Wedding." "The Indian Institute at Oxford."

National Review. Poynder, Sir J. Dickson, "A Bird's-Eye View of the North-West Frontier."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

SEPTEMBER, 1896.

Sanjana, Darab Dastur Peshotan, B.A. ...... "The Kârnâmê Artakhohîr I Pâpakân, being the oldest Surviving Records of the Zoroastrian Emperor, Ardashu Bâbakân." (Bombay: Education Society's Steam Press, Byculla) .. — —

Thurston, Edgar .... "A Dictionary of the Economic Products of India." (Calcutta: Printed by the Superintendent of Government Printing) .... — —

M'Crindle, J. W., M.A. .... "The Invasion of India by Alexander the Great, as described by Arrian, Q. Curtius, Diodorus, and Plutarch." (Constable) .... 10s. 6d.

Ballantine, Henry .... "On India's Frontier; or Nepal, the Gurkha's Mysterious Land." With plates. (Redway) .... 7s. 6d.

Mansford, Charles J. .... "Under the Naga Banner." Illustrated. (John Hogg) .. 3s 6d.

RECENT OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS.

Civil Service Commission:—

India Forest Service and Indian Police Force. June, 1896 .... 1s. 0d

House of Commons Paper:—

[313.] East India (Madras Presidency) (Evictions) —Return relating to .... 0s $0\frac{1}{2}$d.

Printed by A. Bonner, 1 & 2, Took's Court, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, London, S.W.